The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLII DECEMBER 1956 NUMBER 4

RHETORIC AND LITERARY CRITICISM

G. M. A. Grube

ANCIENT literary criticism is prose-centred, whereas it is fair to say that modern criticism tends to concentrate on poetry. Ancient criticism is also strangely objective in the sense that it considers the literary product as a thing in itself, almost divorced from the particular talent, sensitivity, or even purpose of the author; it often restricts itself largely to detailed matters of style and only too often quotes passages or even phrases mainly as successful examples of some rhetorical formula, quality, or figure of speech. The result is that many of our critical texts contain little which we would recognize as literary criticism or discussion of literary values. This is usually thought to be due to the fact that the critics themselves were for the most part teachers of the art of rhetoric, and while theoretically rhetoric was the art of language as a whole, the main emphasis, for most of them, was on oratory.

But why was literary criticism left so largely to the rhetoricians? They, after all, as teachers of the art of language had a particular job to do, and in fact they did it very well: the educated Greek or Roman probably could speak and write more artistically than his modern counterpart. And what of those critics who were not rhetoricians but philosophers? Were they free of rhetorical bias? With the exception of Plato, the answer is in the negative. And the philosophers had much less excuse. Moreover, several of the extant critics, rhetoricians though they were, had a high appreciation of all literature and used their formulae with considerable critical acumen and sensitiveness. This is true not only of Longinus but also of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, even of Demetrius.

In any case, for one alleged weakness of ancient criticism the rhetoricians were not to blame, i.e., for the so-called moral fallacy, the insistence that a good poem is morally good, that the artist is responsible for the moral effect of his work. It is Longinus who shows the deepest understanding of the kind of moral tone one may legitimately require in literature, and Longinus was a rhetorician.

The feeling that the poets are the teachers of men is of course deeply embedded in the Greek mind. It is not found in Homer, but it is found almost

G. M. A. Grube (M.A., Cambridge, 1926) is Professor of Classics at Trinity College, University of Toronto. *This paper was read in Chicago last December at the meeting of the American Philological Association.*

everywhere else. Aristophanes says so quite explicitly, and Plato carried this view to extremes.[1] It is also endorsed by Aristotle, explicitly stated in the *Politics* and taken for granted in the *Poetics*.[2] Plato did admit that the poet does not need to concern himself with the moral effect of his art, but then he had to obey the legislator.[3]

Now this conception of poetry as having a direct message may well be indirectly responsible, at least in part, for the failure of all the critics, whether rhetoricians or philosophers, to differentiate clearly between poetry, prose literature, and speechmaking. The poet with a message is obviously trying to persuade you of something, and the art of rhetoric was the art of persuasion. Even Aristotle, and even in the *Poetics*, refers us to his *Rhetoric* for the means to express thought in poetry, and tells us that the poet and the orator will use the same means for the expression of thought and the rousing of emotions.[4] He also defines the best style in prose and poetry in exactly the same words: that it should be clear without being mean or common, the only difference being that poetry can use certain kinds of ornamentation more freely, only a difference of degree.[5] Moreover, Aristotle says with approval that the poets in his day are giving up poetical language.[6] Literary prose developed in Greece long after poetry, and when poetry was thus classed with rhetoric, it is natural enough that prose should have remained even more closely linked with it, so that the three kinds of rhetoric—forensic, deliberative, and epideictic—continued to be thought of as including all prose, and the third category, the epideictic (originally intended to include sophistical display, encomia, and the reverse) continued to include all prose that could not be classed under the first two heads. This formula of three kinds of prose or rhetoric is of course a rhetorical formula, but, for us at least, it originates with Aristotle.[7] And his remarks on history as being concerned with giving all the facts in a certain period, relevant or otherwise, fails to differentiate between historical writing and chronicles, and is indeed surprising in a man who must have read Herodotus and Thucydides.[8]

It was the Greeks who discovered and developed most of the poetical genres we know, and throughout the classical period poetry was a more essential part of community life than it has probably ever been since; yet no extant critic even tries to define what we should consider the essential nature of poetry, indeed of literature. There was, of course, always the ready distinction that poetry is written in verse, i.e., in exactly recurring metrical patterns. Now Aristotle quite rightly rejects this as a definition of poetry ("Herodotus put into verse would not be poetry"), but he gives no other. He does *not* define it as "dealing with universals by imitation." He said that poetry was imitation, but so are all other arts; elsewhere he says poetry (and

[1] Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 1055; see also 1009-10. Plato, *Republic*, the whole discussion of poetry in the second and third books, and especially 398a-b.

[2] Aristotle accepts the principle of censorship in *Politics*, vii. 17.5 (1336a 30-33). He emphasizes the educational value of *mousike* in *Politics*, viii. 5-7. Cf. *Poetics*, 2.1 (1448a 2-4); 5.1 (1449a 30-35); and compare the word σπουδαῖος in the definition of tragedy in 6.2 (1449b 24) with 2.1 above. See also his insistence that characters in a tragedy must be good in 15.1 (1454a 17), and for a refinement of this 25.8 (1461a 4-9).

[3] *Laws*, 2. 670b; for τὸ τρίτον cf. 669b 1-2.

[4] *Poetics*, 19. 1-3 (1456a 34-b8).

[5] *Poetics*, 22.1 (1458a 18-20) and *Rhetoric*, 3.2.1 (1404b 1-5).

[6] *Rhetoric*, 3. 1. 9 (1404a).

[7] It first occurs in *Rhetoric*, 1. 3. 3 (1358b) and recurs throughout.

[8] *Poetics*, 9. 1-4 (1451b 1-2); and cf. 23. 1-2 (1459a 21-30).

he means dramatic poetry) is more universal than history because it deals with types; with probability, not actuality.[9] Even Plato at times accepts from Gorgias the contention that poetry and prose are essentially the same, and forms of persuasion.[10]

Even poetry's being written in verse meant less to a people as vividly conscious of prose rhythms as the Greeks were. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is obviously aware that the boundary between prose and verse is easily crossed[11] —and so of course, even more so, are we in the twentieth century. Real differences between different kinds of literature do not depend upon externals but upon essentials, and here Plato and Aristotle gave a useful hint each: Plato said that the critic must understand what the writer is aiming at,[12] and Aristotle said that the true differentiae between different forms of literature depend upon the essentially different nature of their imitations.[13] These hints were never followed up. Instead we get a rigid theory of literary genres based entirely upon externals to which Horace gave his emphatic approval.[14] There is a kind of critical nemesis in the fact that this very theory has been so widely, and unsuccessfully, applied to his own *Art of Poetry* that many commentators have been much too busy deciding to what genre it belongs and how it is constructed to pay much attention to what Horace actually says.[15]

In this, as in so many things, criticism in fact followed the path set by the Peripatetic tradition, and by Aristotle in particular. He, too, in the *Rhetoric,* uses quotations from prose and poetry to illustrate rhetorical points, unlike Plato who, when he sets out to criticize a speech of Lysias, at least gives us the whole speech.[16] Then there are those pusillanimous points of detail which Zoilus and others made against Homer, and which Aristotle solemnly answers instead of ignoring them.[17] And be it noted that the other philosophical schools were even less helpful: the Stoics concentrated on allegorizing Homer so as to make a Stoic of him, or on pure linguistics. Their only critical contribution is to have added brevity to the list of rhetorical qualities, and though brevity is much to be commended, it is not in itself a virtue. The Epicureans had little interest in literature and rather despised it, with the possible exception of Philodemus, of whom we know very little, and though Lucretius was a great poet, it was only because he couldn't help himself.

When the philosophers set such a bad example, it is no wonder that the other critics did not shake off the influence of

[9] For Herodotus in verse, see *Poetics,* 9. 1 (1451b 2). E. E. Sikes, in *The Greek View of Poetry* (London, [1931]), discusses this alleged definition of Aristotle at some length (pp. 91 ff., and see especially p. 97). The relevant passages of the *Poetics* are those noted in note 8.

[10] *Gorgias,* 502b-d. The principles established in the second part of the *Phaedrus,* 259e ff., apply to both poetry and prose.

[11] Dionysius, *Composition,* Chs. 25 and 26.

[12] *Laws,* 669a 9.

[13] *Poetics,* 1. 7 (1447b 10-16). The differentiae should be κατὰ μίμησιν· not κατὰ μέτρον·

[14] *Ars Poetica,* 86-91.

[15] On the theory of literary genres and its application to the *Ars Poetica* see R. R. Hack, *The Doctrine of Literary Forms,* in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XXVII (1916). He would make Aristotle responsible for this theory also, and even derives it from Plato.

[16] *Phaedrus,* 230e-234c. Whether the speech is genuine Lysias or a parody does not matter in this respect.

[17] In *Poetics,* 25. 9-10, and the Homeric fragments, he suggests for example that οὐρῆας in *Iliad,* 1. 50, perhaps means sentries not mules (Zoilus had apparently complained that there was no fairness in Apollo sending a plague on the innocent mules first). Aristotle also suggests that when Achilles tells Patroclus to "mix a stronger wine" for the Greek envoys (in 9. 203), he means "mix it more quickly." There is no evidence to support Aristotle in either case.

rhetoric. Perhaps the scholars of the Museum in Alexandria in the third century felt the rhetorical influence least, at least directly. Clearly, they were working in the Peripatetic tradition, and, as scholars will, they sometimes said some foolish things.[18] But Aristarchus at least established some important critical principles, as that all that is said in Homer is not said by Homer, but must be judged in relation to the character who says it. He said that the epic must, linguistically and in social background, be judged by itself and in relation to its own society. He insisted on allowing some poetic license.[19] Of what happened elsewhere in Hellenistic times we know very little, and what we know is not very impressive; some old formulae were discussed again and again: whether it was the function of poetry to entertain (Eratosthenes)[20] or instruct (Neoptolemus) or both, as Horace was later to maintain. There is Neoptolemus' notorious formula that criticism should proceed under three heads—the poetry, the poet, and the poem, which some great scholars have apparently found illuminating, though it seems very dim to me.[21] It was also the time when Hegesias developed the Asiatic style (250 B.C.) and Hermagoras (ca. 150 B.C.) carefully classified all possible kinds of arguments, but we have no evidence that they were critics. If, as I believe, Demetrius' treatise "On Style" is a Hellenistic work, it is a very good example of the kind of thing rhetoricians of the day would do, since the whole work is based on a formula of four elements of style—the grand, the plain, the elegant, and the forcible; and each is discussed under three heads, content, diction, and word-arrangement, with examples drawn from classical literature of all the devices which he considers appropriate in each case. His range is definitely limited, but within that range even he is often interesting, as for example on the epistolary style. His work is infinitely nearer to criticism than, say the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* or the *Ad Herennium*.

It is undoubtedly during the Hellenistic centuries that the rhetorical formulae which we find in later and mostly Roman critics must have been developed and made rigid, that of several different styles, for example, or of a specific number of rhetorical qualities. Be it noted, those who would trace these formulae back to Theophrastus put upon the Peripatetics an even heavier burden of responsibility for the rhetorical nature of Greek criticism than I do.[22] Certainly, the result of all this is that the whole emphasis is on style rather than content, and on details of style, especially among the Romans and the later Greeks. The latter, however, could still be original. Dionysius of Halicarnassus has many faults: at times he carries the "moral fallacy" fur-

[18] As when Zenodotus athetized, *Iliad*, 1. 225-233, the violent insults Achilles hurls at Agamemnon, at the climax of their quarrel ("you sot, with the face of a dog the heart of a deer . . . " etc.) and would begin at once with Achilles' oath not to fight, thereby spoiling the whole climax; or his shocked deletion of Nausicaa's words on first seeing Odysseus that she would like such a man for a husband! (See Plutarch, *De Aud. Poetis*, 276.)

[19] For Aristarchus, see A. Roemer, *Aristarch's Athetezen in der Homerkritik* (Leipzig, 1912), and his *Die Homerexegese Aristarchs in ihren Grundzügen*, ed. E. Belzner (Paderborn, 1924).

[20] Strabo, 1.2.3, where this flippant view of poetry is solemnly refuted; and, for other pronouncements of Eratosthenes, the whole chapter.

[21] For Neoptolemus, see J.W.H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* (London, 1952), I, 173-176, and the references there to Jensen, Norden, and Philodemus.

[22] See my "Thrasymachus, Theophrastus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus," *American Journal of Philology*, *LXXIII* (July 1952), 251-267, (especially pp. 263-266 on the three-style formula); and "Theophrastus as a Literary Critic," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, *LXXXIII* (1952), 172-183.

ther than any man except perhaps Plutarch, as when he condemns Thucydides as unpatriotic because he wrote the history of a war which Athens lost; he quite fails to appreciate the rich variations of Plato's diction and is quite blind to his sense of humor; at times he applies his list of qualities and other formulae with the monotony of one who chalks up the score at a billiard match; and he does say Philistus is a better model for budding orators than Thucydides (which was probably true).[23]

For, in spite of his at times obvious faults, Dionysius' critical works are less obsessed by rhetoric than anything since Plato, except the *Poetics*. Instead of scattered passages used to illustrate this or that rhetorical point, he often uses his formulae to reach an estimate of an author's work as a whole, and he applies them well. His essays on Lysias, Isocrates, and Thucydides, for example, are far better literary criticism than anything that had gone before, and all our evidence tends to show that his claims to originality are fully justified. His essay on Demosthenes is less good, because it suffers from hero worship, but his method of comparative criticism, his long representative quotations fully discussed, his rewriting of certain passages to illustrate a point (not to improve his author), all these are sound and effective. His conception of the critic's function is suprisingly wide.[24] Above all, there is his treatise on Word-Arrangement. It is explicitly a specialized treatise on one aspect of style, an aspect which modern critics neglect. It is, of course, in the objective tradition: prose writers and poets are used indifferently to illustrate his three kinds of Arrangement, i.e., the varying music of words obtained by the collocation of sounds and by prose rhythm. He goes too far when he tries to reduce prose rhythm to metrical feet, but that is a weakness which he shares with both Cicero and Quintilian. It is all rhetorical criticism, but rhetorical criticism at its best.

The influence of rhetoric on literature was much more direct in Rome than in Greece. Whatever their rhetoricians and critics might say, the Greeks always loved literature, and particularly poetry, for its own sake. Not so the practical Romans—and therefore the subordination of literature to rhetoric was more complete, and the poets themselves were apt to be more rhetorical. This is true even of Virgil, and of course it became much more true during the first century A.D., when the influence of the rhetorical schools, and in particular of the practice of declamation, led to the excesses of the silver Latin style. Yet even so, all the Roman critics are at one in their condemnation of these excesses—even Seneca the Elder, who loved them, quite definitely condemns the fantastic nature of the declamations in his day and the artificiality of style to which they led—so do Petronius, Persius, and of course Quintilian. All of them, including Cicero and Tacitus, try to defend the general education in philosophy and literature which Cicero himself had enjoyed, and to which he attributed his great success as an orator.

The one place where one might have expected a defense of literature for its own sake was the schools of the *grammatici* in the first century B.C.—a number of these men were scholars of high repute and gathered around them a circle of young *cognoscenti* whose primary purpose was the enjoyment of literature. Yet when rhetoric came to claim

[23] All this in the *Letter to Pompey*. For Plato's diction, see also *Demosthenes*, Chs. 5-7.

[24] *De Oratoribus*, Ch. 4, where he says he will state which are the best orators and historians καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἐγένοντο προαιρέσεις τοῦ τεθίου καὶ τοῦ λόγου κτλ·

apparent. Drottningholm is, in a sense, the culmination of the theories of production and stage management that began in the Italian Renaissance and are preserved for us in the familiar works of Serlio and Sabbatini. At first glance, the intention seems to be realism. The deep stage is gently ramped to assist in creating the illusion of built perspective, and the six pairs of wings and a backdrop required for each full set, when seen from the center front (the king's position when he chose to be present *in propria persona*), are a close approximation of a box setting. From less privileged points of view, the solid setting is obviously broken into "leaves"; yet the advantage to the producer of a panoramic, or many-scened, play is obvious. All the wings and the drop are connected by a complex system of ropes to a windlass in the cellar which, when turned by a half-a-dozen men, can effect a complete set change in six seconds. Sabbatini's famous wave-machine is available—five parallel rollers, like huge wooden corkscrews, placed across the stage at the back. When revolved, they give the impression of a rolling sea to the life, at least to the life of this *mise en scène*, somewhat better than the projected surf of the modern stage. Other machines are more spectacular and somewhat less realistic: cloud omnibuses for the convenience of traveling goddesses, a fountain in full spurt that suddenly appears or disappears by "a quaint device."

If the stage lighting leaves something to be desired in terms of modern practice, it is neither primitive nor quaint but correct. Behind each wing a set of metal candle holders with reflectors is suspended on a vertical chain. To vary the lighting, the candles can be pivoted towards or away from the acting area. But it must be remembered that the auditorium itself was lighted throughout the performance, so that dramatic lighting and the nuances of shadow and accent were neither possible nor desired.

The desideratum, the kind of dramatic experience the courtly audience of the eighteenth century was seeking, is of course the most important secret that Drottningholm has to yield. The marble of the auditorium is not mere painted wood because the court could not afford real marble had it so wished. The auditorium and the stage were not equally lighted throughout the performance because no means could be devised for dimming the house. Drottningholm is a theatre of pure fakery—and both terms must be given their full meaning and equal weight.

During a performance the completeness of this theatre of pure fakery is apparent. Modern actors, however carefully trained to imitate the conventional gestures and postures recorded in contemporary prints, will unconsciously slip into modern conventions of representing the passions and affections. It is these moments of what we might call representational acting—a real tear in a painted marble hall—that jar even upon the spectator accustomed to real tears. The carefully built and painted perspective of the setting may suggest the growth of a theory of realistic staging to the historian in search of continuity. The theatre itself, especially when in action, suggests quite the contrary: far from being realistic in intent, the scenery and machinery emphasize the artifice of a wholly unreal world.

Efficient though the machines may be, they are not intended to fool anyone. Although the "waves" are more suggestive than projected effects, a small profile ship bounding about between them and finally going down with all cutout hands on board is something less than realis-

tic. It should, however, be contrasted with the full scale shipwreck of *Les Indes Galantes* spread across the enormous stage of the Paris Opéra. In a combination of glides and jerks the great bark picked its tentative way through geometrically crashing waves until at midstage it began to disintegrate, spar by spar and mast by mast, the remains being hauled off right by a not-quite-visible rope. The hocus-pocus of phony realism calls attention to itself as a mechanical device; the Drottningholm shipwreck delights as poetic machinery and is accepted as part of an organic whole, like the poetic machinery of Titian or Dürer.

The major effects for which the Drottningholm machines were designed were of course, deliberately fantastic. The imagination of the audience was stimulated by the unrealism of ascending and descending gods as it never can be by the unfathomable magic of motion pictures. On the modern screen, through double exposure, a goddess may sail through the clouds without visible means of support, and the audience will accept the shot at the same level of experience as a cowboy loping over the hills on Old Paint. But at Drottningholm, tonight's Venus might have been glimpsed by last night's curious spectators behind the lattice with the king, thus doubling the responsibility of their imagination as they transform her into a pagan goddess, and the canvas-covered ropes and platform into a cloud chariot propelled and directed by supernatural power. In one conventional scene of the Drottningholm production of *Orlando Furioso*, the hero is rescued from his enemies by being transformed into a water fountain; the motion picture camera can achieve this beyond any possibility of the audience questioning its truth—a miracle is just another miracle. On this stage a profile-board fountain covered with strands of tinsel suddenly shoots out of a trap in front of the actor, who then retires discreetly behind a neighborly wing. Of course no member of the audience "believed" it, or was momentarily deceived, or even surprised. But the modern spectator gasps a little, that anyone would dare to do such a thing, then smiles, and gets on with the business of being entertained. What the performance emphasizes is the impossibility of the impossible. The drama is all *show*, all artifice, like the painted theatre itself, and like the court for which the theatre was constructed—a Swedish court that spoke only French, and built Chinese castles and wooden privies in the shape of tents, with every fold of the canvas carefully carved by hand.

What the audience was seeking was the illusion of illusion, not the illusion of reality. The fact of artifice was the important thing, a fact that explains many of the other aspects of the eighteenth-century drama: the beginnings of melodrama, the stagy plotting, the grotesque characterization. What it does not explain, of course, is the other element historians are so concerned about, the invasion of the popular theatre by the beginnings of realism. But Drottningholm was not a popular theatre; its seats were permanently reserved and the assignments are still marked on them: *ladies of the court, cavaliers, pages, actresses at the royal theatre, diplomatic corps.* The taste of the masses was no business of this small, elegant world.

II

It can, however, be one of the concerns of the theatrical tourist. In Bristol, England, there stands a Theatre Royal (which means, the tourist must

note without comment, a commercial theatre) built at almost the same moment as the theatre in Drottningholm and recently restored. Like Drottningholm it is still a practicable theatre, not a museum, and is the permanent home of the Bristol Old Vic company. It is, apparently, a conventional popular English theatre of the period, built according to the plans of David Garrick's Drury Lane in London rather than according to the whims of stage-struck royalty. It was intended, that is, to satisfy the demands of the paying public; it is the more surprising, therefore, to discover the essential similarities between a house of entertainment for the English middle classes and the aristocratic toy of a remote Scandinavian court.

The auditorium of the Theatre Royal, Bristol, is not much larger than Drottningholm's; yet, because of the introduction of encircling galleries, it accommodates almost three times the number of spectators. If it does not rejoice in panels of marbled wood, it is not sparing of gilt paint heavily and strategically laid on to reflect the glow of hundreds of candles affixed to the front of the boxes. The ceiling is thickly strewn with stars attendant upon a rococo sunburst, a twinkling cover for a glittering jewel box. The eighteenth-century popular audience, in short, took its pleasure in a setting no less artificial or demanding of attention than the courtly audience at Drottningholm.

The stage is ramped to increase the realism of wing-and-backdrop perspective, and, although the original scenery has worn out in use, an early inventory assures us that the designers for the Swedish court would not have to restudy their art to work at Bristol. Here again are the conventional six pairs of wings and borders for a full set, and a windlass below the stage for scene-shifting. If there is no record of a cloud-chariot (though one must have been available for Hecate in *Macbeth*), there is an indication of supernatural effects in an "Illusion Chamber" and two "illusion cupboards" for magical entrances and exits. For "natural" effects, as at Drottningholm, there are six "rolling water waves" and, above the stage, a thunder run, a metal chute seventy-six feet long equipped with eighty iron balls. An apparent gesture of realism, though more probably designed for efficient spectacle, is an alcove at the back of the stage to provide *real* distance when desirable. This must not be taken as a concession to popular taste—the greater depth of the stage at Drottningholm made it unnecessary; such an alcove was constructed in the smaller court theatre of Christiansborg castle in Copenhagen. Thus, in its own insular way, the commercial Theatre Royal achieved the balance of illusion and reality observed in the Swedish royal theatre.

But in one important physical aspect the two theatres differ. True to its heritage from the Elizabethan playhouse, the English theatre had an apron (since removed) extending from the front of the proscenium well into the auditorium. Again the emphasis is on artifice, for however realistic the settings and machines, the actors at Bristol were disengaged from them. They played their scenes on a formal platform in front of the proscenium in the midst of a fully lighted audience. The resultant paradox in the art of stage management is analogous to the famous paradox in the art of the actor set forth in this very period by Diderot: as the actor is and is not the character he assumes, so the actor is in but not of the physical production.

Of this the audience must have been at least subconsciously aware. In the U-

shaped auditorium the focus of attention was naturally on the performer, rather than on the setting apart from which he was happy to perform. If the action involved some business with the scenery (hiding a lover in the closet, for a familiar example), we may be sure that it was handled with dispatch so that the actress could return to the position most favorable to herself and to the spectators, on the apron. There is an often-reproduced drawing of the very solid-looking setting of the Screen Scene in the original production of *The School for Scandal* (1777). At first glance Lady Teazle appears to be behind the fallen screen among the bookshelves of Charles' library, as she might find herself in a modern box set. This drawing, of course, need not be taken as evidence of eighteenth-century stage practice, for in the designer's sketches for the actual settings preserved at Drottningholm there is ample proof of a divergence between plan and execution; scene designers and scenic artists work in separate and equally accepted conventions. But a close analysis of the *Scandal* drawing reveals that the backdrop of bookshelves is behind the third set of wings, that the front of the stage is at the second box in the auditorium, and that the fallen screen lies beneath the proscenium arch. Lady Teazle, with her chair, is thus almost at the curtain line and the other characters are firmly on the apron stage.

It is pleasant to imagine the intensified comic potentiality of this familiar scene when it is not desirable, as in the modern theatre, to hide Lady Teazle realistically from her fellow actors and the spectators behind a screen placed against the upstage wall. Let the wings and backdrop reproduce Charles's quarters as authentically as possible, but place the screen on the forestage where Lady Teazle's response to the action may be observed by the more fortunately placed spectators, but not of course by her fellow players—who were accustomed by long habit to not seeing or hearing matters plainly visible and audible to a thousand other people in the same room.

For the popular as for the courtly audience of the eighteenth century, theatre-going was—for lack of a better term—a theatrical experience. They did not expect or demand the illusion of life, but of something more and perhaps better than life. This is a demand reflected in many of their tastes and habits (the geometric garden, the unruffleable wig, the long-lived heroic couplet, architectural form derived from external order and balance rather than from internal function) though less noticeable as the century progressed toward the romantic revival.

III

It will surprise no one acquainted with dramatic history that both Drottningholm and the Bristol Theatre Royal exploited the illusion of illusion. The artificiality of eighteenth-century writing is a commonplace of the drama handbooks. But artifice is an abstract term, and the theatre has small tolerance for abstractions. Do the existence of these structures and the experience of production within them make more precise the manner, the kind, the quality of artifice they favored?

It is perhaps elementary, but necessary, to point out that artifice may move in two directions from the natural: towards the formal and towards the grotesque. Loveit is directed to shake the hand of Heartless in greeting: he may pump it up and down with the violence of a burlesque comedian; he may touch the fingers. Witless is lavish-

ly supplied with false comparisons and feeble epigrams; he may fling them about the stage in a kind of verbal *tours jetés,* or he may enounce them with the solemn conviction of the self-deceived. Which kind of artifice will best adjust itself to the total concept of the theatre of illusion?

Eighteenth-century tragedy, of course, is no problem. Seldom revived, it is written with such implacable gelidity that few directors would be tempted to anything beyond the formality of classical ballet. But if the leading actors in revivals of eighteenth-century comedy are sometimes permitted a certain dignity and reserve, the lesser roles are generally directed into a kind of frenzied puppet-play, with pratfalls and other spectacular *lazzi* introduced into the text, and the men required to perform as if they were female impersonators at heart. The result may be highly amusing—few theatregoers will forget Cyril Ritchard's Tattle in Geilgud's various revivals of *Love for Love* or Bobby Clarke's Bob Acres, which left the Players production of *The Rivals* so much comic shredded wheat. But shredded wheat was hardly what Sheridan intended to produce, and effeminacy, a reasonably sure-fire provoker of laughter in the modern theatre, was hardly the conventional pose of a Restoration rake, even an unsuccessful one.

We do not lack, of course, for drawings and descriptions of eighteenth-century actors at work or for critical essays and handbooks on acting technique. But such works are interpretations rather than records and inevitably confuse reaction and action. There is plenty of evidence that, although equipped with the mechanical aids of film and recorder, even the most conscientious efforts of later periods to preserve the actor's style and technique fail to capture its essential condition, which is creation in the passing moment, in the contemporary theatre, in the presence of an audience.

Two of these elements are readily available. First, we can reconstitute the tastes, attitudes, and beliefs of a given audience by a careful study of their manifestations in all aspects of living, domestic and social as well as aesthetic. Second, in the case of the eighteenth century, two theatres survive with enough features in common to permit us to reconstruct the basic principles of stage practice, without recourse to theoreticians and philosophers. Both elements, the contemporary audience and the contemporary theatre, will take us a considerable distance on the road to understanding.

For the third element, the acting style, the theatrical tourist is permitted to observe a survival, a tradition, that has continued unbroken (though not unmodified) from the eighteenth century: the comic style of the Comédie Française.

It is tempting to view the Salle Richelieu as a Museum of Ancient Art. A theatre which carefully preserves its own archives, under the cranky eye of a full-time archivist who—one suspects—is persuaded that Baron and Talma are still the nightly attractions, is an institution without counterpart in American experience. Sitting in the venerable and comfortless auditorium, the spectator is led to expect the sanctified boredom which surrounds the exhibition of "The Night Watch" in the Rijksmuseum. The expectation is happily frustrated.

Nothing could be further from the effect of scholarly resurrection or conscientious stylization than Marivaux' *Les Fausses Confidences* at the Comédie. To be sure, the play is several decades older than the theatres at Drottning-

holm and Bristol, but in subject matter, structure, and attitude it would have been comfortably familiar to their audiences. The working out of the carefully balanced turns and counterturns of a love chase was the common dramatic property of the loosely named Age of Reason. It is therefore a fitting subject in the tourist's search into the theatre's past.

It is true that Marivaux is not Congreve or Cibber or Sheridan; he is more concerned with the polished phrase than with witty repartee; he displays the folly of his characters with sympathetic amusement rather than gleeful superiority. Yet the English and French comic writers of the time were members of the same mystery. No one, on stage or off, is ever permitted to doubt the success of the pursuer or the submission of the pursued. From the rise of the curtain the other man or woman is as certainly doomed to defeat as the hero and heroine to marriage. The unchanging dramaturgical concern is the postponement of the inevitable: in Marivaux as in Sheridan the hero is forever departing "*feignant d'être déconcerté*," and the heroine forever pretending to banish him. But the departure, like the banishment, is done with the assurance of his return. The emotions of heartbreak, or heart's joy, like the transports of social or amorous pretenders, remain in the wings, since, to paraphrase their great contemporary on a more serious subject, where there is leisure for calculation, for *confidences*, there can be little room for passion.

After a painstaking study of the aesthetic traditions and the acting conventions of the time, Jean-Louis Barrault staged a revival of *Les Fausses Confidences* in 1946 that was at once a reincarnation and a revelation. From him the actors of the national theatre rediscovered the secrets of their own tradition. The effect was not unlike the removal of a Victorian porch from a Greek-revival courthouse; a play which had remained in the repertory through subsidized inertia suddenly asserted its own life and truth.

To attend a performance of *Les Fausses Confidences* at the Comédie is like stepping for the first time into the auditorium at Drottningholm. Marivaux' work is no longer a part of the history of French literature but a living experience. The production is not pedantically sound and theatrically dead, nor theatrically slick and historically ignorant; it is neither arty nor condescending. Stylization it has, to be sure, but, instead of dominating the performance, stylization underlies it, as the archives underlie the theatre itself. The almost geometric structuring of the plot is faithfully reflected in the staging, but if the spectator is reminded of comic ballet, it is only a suggestion, never an insistence.

The key seems to have been taken from the lines of the heroine. When her kneeling lover finally declares, in the third act, what both of them have known for many scenes, Araminte commands, "modérez votre joie; levez-vous, Dorante." Earlier she has declared that a piece of bad news has left her "tout émue," but it is an announcement, not a demonstration. From this attitude of moderation the production derives its style. And if the audience is aware that, under such circumstances, moderation can be no more than an attitude, this is a perennial condition for favorable comic response: it is Buster Keaton's frozen-faced acceptance of catastrophe or blessing, it is the detailed extrapolation of paradoxes in *The Importance of Being Earnest* as opposed to the adolescent frenzy of *Brother Rat*.

Part of the secret is in taking time, in refusing to cut corners, or to hurry over the obvious. There is little in this play, or these plays, that is not obvious. The basic plot and mischances which keep it spinning antedate written drama; the characters were masks in the wardrobe trunks of Plautus and the Italian Comedians. Yet the audience is never required to take them for granted. Araminte must deliver the expected reply to her lover after he has declared his love as she has done in a thousand similar situations; she does not admit its theatrical inevitability by "getting it over with," or confess her own embarrassment with an attitude of mockery. Observe, instead, the thoughtful fingertip as it traces its slow way with increasing decision across her cheek from earlobe to lip. This is the player's pointing of Marivaux' not-so-simple direction: *le regardant quelque temps sans parler.* And the necessary words come, if not from the heart, from the soul. Such explicit stage business permits the actor to insist on the self-renewing truth of the *Thirty-Six Dramatic Situations.*

To take time to be explicit is one essential. To shun the tricksy, the novel distortion, is another. Araminte, instead of indulging in fancy work with a fan and floating on tiptoe with short steps, moves with great calmness and economy, hands poised at her sides and head gracefully inclined. Her reactions are equally calm and measured, and the comic movement (enter and exit on the run) is left, rather sparingly, to the men. Even the elderly Madame Argante, who is (justifiably) suspicious of all young suitors as fortune hunters, must be guided by her casing of whalebone and stays rather than by the temptation to clown. With her enforced dignity Lady Wishfort or Mrs. Malaprop would take their places in the human comedy, released from the freak-show to which they have been condemned by generations of misprision. The true style for such drama, as this production of *Les Fausses Confidences* reveals, is urbane rather than grotesque, more like the scenes from actual comedies painted by Pietro Longhi than the frantic circuses of Rowlandson.

Further, each actor performs, as a Danish player once observed, as if he were Crusoe on his Island. The key to the "method," if the term is not overworn, seems to be the disengagement of the actor in the midst of the close entanglements of the action. The problem, as with the English comedy of the Restoration and the eighteenth century, is always the same: the lover's conquest, the loved-one's yielding. The conquest is pursued with vigor and endless contrivance, the yielding is reluctant but inevitable and complete. Yet the coolness, the measured style of the actors, projects the deeper theme, the eternal comedy of human relationships. Stanislavsky is hidden in the mysteries of the post-romantic future.

IV

Admittedly theatrical touring is an elementary kind of research, and a record of it is closer to journalism than to scholarship. Yet both the act and the record have their place in the study of drama and stage. The drama is in part a literary art and readily yields to the accepted methods of literary scholarship; the theatre is a structure in time and place and welcomes the archaeologist. The rediscovery of a theatre will be an end in itself only to the antiquary. To the humanist it will provide the key to discoveries about style and manner and purpose; to the student and critic of dramatic literature, a surer measure of the intentions and achievements of the playwright. But has this search into the

past any use for the contemporary theatre and its audiences?

To this question the first international conference of the Federation for Theatre Research devoted one-fourth of its discussion time in July, 1955. Both the fraction and the date are important. It is something less than frequent for either the historian or the modern director to acknowledge that their concerns are even remotely mutual. And 1955 marks the recognition on the international level, though perhaps only the self-recognition, that theatre research is, or can be, a professional scholarly discipline as respectable as philology or textual criticism.

The discussion was necessarily preliminary. For one thing, as I have pointed out elsewhere, the historians were unnecessarily apologetic, as if a researcher were some sort of ghoul. For another, all theatre people, including theatre historians, are stage-struck, and hence reluctant not to place what is called, I believe, Living Theatre above all else. Since Living Theatre is frequently more Zombie than Ariel and the theatre of the past (Dead Theatre?) has its moments of immortality, the reluctance like the apology was misplaced. For if academicians have, on occasion, devoted more than enough ingenuity to discovering the exact location of the audience doors of the Globe Theatre and to preserving nonfunctional anecdotes about William Davenant, proponents of Living Theatre have preoccupied themselves with superelectronic switchboards and ingenious patchwork from the Broadway ragbag.

My colleague, Edward Hubler, once pointed out that the modern producer of Shakespeare had an ample "bank account" on which he could draw in the critical studies that have accumulated on the library shelves. To this a modern producer at the 1955 conference was quick to reply that his insight as a "practical man of the theatre" was at least as sound as any literary critic's. But if theory was on the side of the modern producer, evidence was against him. He had forgotten, perhaps, how Granville-Barker had rescued Shakespeare from the devout distortions of the Irving school by applying to his own productions the principles revealed in William Poel's antique shows. The modern producer was unaware, apparently, of the revitalization of French classical drama as a consequence of the scholarly investigation of Barrault and Jouvet; of the discovery of the essential dramatic method of Strindberg in the researches of his greatest modern interpreter, the Swedish director, Molender; and of similar research resulting in similar modern rebirth of Goldoni and Holberg and Sophocles.

Less excusable is the willful blindness of the modern producer to the reasons for general dissatisfaction with Shakespeare produced in the overstuffed tradition of the nineteenth century, like the Theatre Guild *As You Like It*, or according to a commitment to some personal conviction, like Stanislavsky's *Othello*. After checking the box office receipts he will conclude that Shakespeare spells ruin and—(fill in what classic name you will) means bankruptcy, but he will have refused to see that what has been displayed on his stage has been the body of a play without the soul which gave it life in its own day and can alone bring it to life on our stage. To this soul, the inner structure of the work, the logic of its articulation, the concept of dramatic function and human character that were conventionally established between artist and spectator and given physical expression in the theatre building and methods of pro-

duction—to this soul, theatre research can lead the contemporary producer.

That is, reconstitution of the stage practice of the past, inspired by imagination, but guided by the methods and conscience of scholarship, can be useful in both a general and a specific way. The general value is perhaps least controversial: any effort at recapturing the form and style of a period is bound to lead to a closer understanding of the inner nature of the period and hence to a more just evaluation of its art. The specific value is as yet so controversial that the better part of wisdom is only to glance at it: even a partial recapturing of the form and style of a period, if it does not inhibit the Shakespeare-improvers, the Augustin Dalys, the Orson Welleses, will at least give critics and audiences a perspective for the evaluation of their ministry.

OLD PLAYWRIGHTS

> Webster was a far more considerable man than Marston, and infinitely above him in genius. Without the poetic nature of Marlowe, or Chapman's somewhat unwieldy vigor of thought, he had that inflammability of mind which, untempered by a solid understanding, made his plays a strange mixture of vivid expression, incoherent declamation, dramatic intensity, and extravagant conception of character. He was not, in the highest sense of the word, a great dramatist. Shakespeare is the only one of that age. Marlowe had a rare imagination, a delicacy of sense that made him the teacher of Shakespeare and Milton in versification, and was, perhaps, as purely a poet as any that England has produced; but his mind had no balance-wheel. Chapman abounds in splendid enthusiasms of diction, and now and then dilates our imaginations with suggestions of profound poetic depth. Ben Jonson was a conscientious and intelligent workman, whose plays glow, here and there, with the golden pollen of that poetic feeling with which his age impregnated all thought and expression; but his leading characteristic, like that of his great namesake, Samuel, was a hearty common sense, which fitted him rather to be a great critic than a great poet. He had a keen and ready eye for the comic in situation, but no humor. Fletcher was as much a poet as fancy and sentiment can make any man. Only Shakespeare wrote comedy and tragedy with truly ideal elevation and breadth. Only Shakespeare had that true sense of humor which, like the universal solvent sought by the alchemists, so fuses together all the elements of a character, (as in Falstaff), that any question of good or evil, of dignified or ridiculous, is silenced by the apprehension of its thorough humanity. Rabelais shows gleams of it in Panurge; but, in our opinion, no man ever possessed it in an equal degree with Shakespeare, except Cervantes; no man has since shown anything like an approach to it, (for Molière's quality was comic power rather than humor,) except Sterne, Fielding, and perhaps Richter.
>
> James Russell Lowell, "Library of Old Authors," in *The Writings of James Russell Lowell* (Boston and New York, 1892), I, 277-278.

THE VARIETIES OF INDIVIDUAL SPEECH

Eliot Freidson

I

IT is a truism that speech provides the student of man with his richest data. Indeed, what man communicates by means of speech has been the basic data of the social scientist, and without them even so-called behaviorism becomes only a program of ingenious speculation. But in spite of the obvious importance of speech, the practical demands of investigation have tended to lead the student to take speech itself for granted and concern himself only with what it has communicated to him. On the whole, only when speech has become somewhat peculiar and somewhat difficult to understand has it per se come to the investigator's attention.

II

But if the student of man becomes interested in the actual speech of his subject—whether the fluency of its progression or its grammatical and lexical characteristics—he cannot assess the data he gathers without having some norm, some standard.[1] Only with some standard can he judge whether the characteristics he discovers are psychologically significant or symptomatic. And it is the accuracy or propriety of his standard that determines the value of his conclusions. If, for example, the investigator assumes that it is normal for an individual to speak "grammatically" at all times, he will tend to conclude that "ungrammatical" speech is significant of some disorder.

Since students of human behavior have not on the whole concerned themselves with the character of speech in the subject who communicates to them satisfactorily (i.e., the normal speaker), they lack any but the crudest notions of what normal speech is actually like. Given the lack of a self-conscious standard, they are not well equipped to deal with the very cases that interest them, cases in which the character of the subject's speech becomes a pressing practical and conceptual problem. Without such a standard, much that may be irrelevant can attract an unfortunate amount of attention and much that may be highly significant can escape atten-

Eliot Freidson (Ph.D., The University of Chicago, 1952) is Assistant Professor of Sociology at The City College of New York. This paper was written while he was a Research Assistant for the Language and Symbolism Project, Department of Philosophy, University of Michigan.

[1] For studies of a large number of aspects of individuals' speech, see S. N. Newman, "Behavior Patterns in Linguistic Structure: A Case Study," in L. Spier et al., *Language, Culture, and Personality* (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1941), pp. 94-106; and S. N. Newman and V. G. Mather, "Analysis of Spoken Speech of Patients with Affective Disorders," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, XCIV (1938), 913-942.

For studies of fluency, see S. J. Baker, "Speech Disturbances, a Case for a Wider View of Paraphasia," *Psychiatry*, XI (1948), 359-366, N. Cameron and A. Magaret, "Experimental Studies in Thinking: I. Scattered Speech in the Responses of Normal Subjects to Incomplete Sentences," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXIX (1949), 617-627, and N. Cameron and A. Magaret, "Correlates of Scattered Speech in the Responses of Normal Subjects to Incomplete Sentences," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, XLIII (1950), 77-84.

An interesting example of a study of the grammatical and lexical characteristics of speech is E. R. Balken, "A Delineation of Schizophrenic Language and Thought in a Test of Imagination," *Journal of Psychology*, XVI (1943), 239-271.

tion entirely.[2] And without a *shared* standard, every investigator attends only to what he personally thinks is significant, thus making his results often incompatible and incomparable with those of other investigators.

It is clear that some accurate and explicit conception of the character of the speech of the normal individual would be useful in formulating and evaluating research into the speech of disturbed individuals. This paper will present a tentative formulation of the general characteristics of the normal individual's speech.

III

It may be wondered at the outset whether a particular language does not itself provide us with a norm. One may say that an individual's speech is either English or it is not. This is the implicit criterion used by those investigators who speak of "word-salad," "neologisms" and "bizarre" constructions in the speech of psychotics; these constructions are not conventional English even though they are composed from the elements of English.

But Vendryes points out that such a thing as English does not exist in the language spoken by any human being.[3] The notion of "a" language is only a conventional fiction that may tend to obscure more than it illuminates when we get down to the individual. No individual speaks exactly like another even though both speak "English." However, since Vendryes indicates that "there are . . . as many languages as [there are social] groups,"[4] perhaps it is possible to isolate the main types of groups and by so doing delineate the main types of English. Rather than using merely English as our norm of speech, we can use the English that is appropriate to the individual's social background.

Bloomfield distinguishes five main types of speech to be found in a complex society like that of the United States.[5] First, there is the *literary standard*—written speech that presents us with the most formal type of discourse. Second, there is the *colloquial standard*—the most formal type of spoken speech, usually displayed by members of the privileged class. Third, there is the *provincial standard* spoken by the middle class—"very close to the colloquial standard but differing slightly from province to province."[6] Fourth, there is the *substandard*, spoken in the United States by almost all speakers but those of the upper and upper-middle class—this type of speech shows minor local variations. Fifth, there is the *local dialect*, spoken by the lowest class of a locality and sometimes incomprehensible to outsiders or members of the more privileged classes. There are also, of course, various *argots*. All these types of American English differ from one another by virtue of differences in portions of their vocabularies, in their pronunciation, and in their grammatical structure.

In this description of various types of speech within a speech community, Bloomfield recognizes that a number of people within a larger society may traffic with each other and thus develop their own special and peculiar ways of speaking a particular language. We unconsciously tend to adjust ourselves to that fact, not expecting a man from the Kentucky Hills to speak like a man from the Louisville sporting set, or, to contrast occupational groups, a laborer to

[2] For an example of what appears to be irrelevant, see Baker, *op. cit.*

[3] J. Vendryes, *Language: A Linguistic Introduction to History* (London, 1925), p. 242.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

[5] L. Bloomfield, *Language* (New York, 1933), pp. 46-54.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

speak like an engineer. In this sense it is not English per se that we tend to use as one of our implicit norms of speech, but rather some type of American English appropriately spoken by one of the subgroups within the American English speech community. Psychologically, we pay attention to the lack of respectable usage in the speech of a member of the privileged class, but we expect and thus ignore such a lack in the speech of a member of less privileged groups.

If we had a description of the various types of speech within the larger speech community, could we use that as the standard by which we may judge whether an individual's speech is peculiar or not? We could do this if it is true that the individual members of any social group always speak in the same way, but this is manifestly not the case. For example, Bloomfield notes that the upperclass Swiss who speaks Standard German uses the local dialect of Swiss German as his normal mode of communicating with family and neighbors.[7] The individual does not necessarily speak the same way all the time and under all circumstances. Thus, both the linguist's construct of "a" language and of "a" subtype or dialect or jargon cannot be used as our standard for judging individual speech. The characteristics of an individual's speech seem to vary with the type of person he addresses.

Although a majority of Americans speak substandard English, we tend to characterize "the" language by its most respectable form—Standard American English. It is not inconvenient to do this so long as we do not make the mistake of assuming that everyone normally speaks Standard American English, and thus of analyzing deviations as extraordinary. In the same sense, we tend to characterize an individual's speech by its most respectable usage rather than by the informal usage that is perhaps more frequent in actual occurrence. It is not inconvenient to do this either so long as we do not make the mistake of assuming that it is normal for the individual to speak only in that fashion and assess deviations as extraordinary. If the individual's speech varies normally, the investigator must know how and when it varies before he is able to discern extraordinary variation and draw significant conclusions from it.

IV

Even though the normal individual's speech cannot be characterized adequately by the abstract conception of "the" language he speaks, or "the" subtype that members of the social groups to which he belongs are generally supposed to speak, the English language itself as well as its subtypes of course must form the beginning of any characterization. The problem remains to inquire into the varieties of the individual's speech and see if it is possible to discern generalities of variation that may apply to all individuals.

Let us take a concrete individual and see what striking varieties he will use. Let us assume he is a professor of some science who will probably speak to an assembly of other scientists on some occasion. How does he speak to such a group?

> The exact responses, and the careful and often complex calculations of science, enforce an unusually meticulous style of speech. The syntactic scope of forms and the domain of substitutes [i.e., words, like "personal pronouns," that can substitute for others] have to be clearly indicated. This, with the elimination of personal factors, produces a general scientific style of utterance.[8]

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[8] L. Bloomfield, "Linguistic Aspects of Science," *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* (Chicago, 1955), 1, 42.

The professor uses an elaborate vocabulary whose words are explicitly defined—indeed, much of scientific discourse consists in explicit definition of terms so that possible misunderstanding is anticipated and dispelled—and a highly elaborate system of grammatical signals that is carefully used. Most importantly, this variety of speech is highly impersonal; to understand one need know only the systematic signals of grammatical meaning and the specialized vocabulary; one need not fill in further meanings according to one's knowledge of the personality or social background of the speaker or the concrete situation in which he is speaking.[9] This variety of speech is eminently public and strains to approach the timeless and universal: mathematics is its constant ideal of impersonality and objectivity.

In such speech we would tend to find as close an approximation of "the" grammatical structure of American English as the particular individual is able to produce. We would tend to find a great deal of precise qualification of meaning and a large number of distinctly specialized words that eliminate frequent use of one word in many contexts and through this means eliminate the risk of both "ambiguity" and unwanted connotations. Such elaborateness of speech makes for a high degree of redundancy.

However, when this same professor is speaking to intimates, he will speak in a totally different way that forms the opposite observable extreme:

> Generally speaking, the smaller the circle, and the more complex the understanding already arrived at within it, the more economical can the act of communication afford to become. A single word passed between members of an intimate group, in spite of its apparent vagueness, and ambiguity, may constitute a far more precise communication than volumes of carefully prepared correspondence interchanged between two governments.[10]

The professor will not demonstrate the same speech characteristics that he uses to address a scientific society when he speaks to his close friends, his wife and family, or himself, even if he speaks about the same thing. His vocabulary will be much smaller; a single word will be used in a variety of ways, requiring that the listener himself distinguish the appropriate meaning in any instance, rather than "unambiguously" indicating the appropriate meaning by a special term. His grammatical usage will tend to become truncated in character, without heavy reliance on the elaborate possibilities of American English grammar. All this makes for a minimization of redundancy.

A good example of such informal speech is described by Gardiner:

> A certain James Hawkins is sitting in his study in the afternoon . . . together with Mary his wife. Both are reading and completely absorbed in their books. At a given moment James becomes aware of a continued beating upon the window-pane which he identifies as the sound of rain, a conclusion verified a moment later by a glance towards the window. The perception of the rain reminds him that his wife and he have decided to walk over to Riverside for tea, should the weather hold. Another glance convinces James that this is no mere shower, and that the idea of the walk must be abandoned. . . . Since she, however, shows no sign of having noticed the rain, her husband decides to call her attention to it, which he does with the simple ejaculation, *Rain!* Hearing that word, Mary looks up, sees the rain falling in torrents, realizes the effect that this is going to have on her afternoon, and replies, *What a bore!*[11]

[9] By "understand" is meant that which is indicated by the auditor's being able to respond to an utterance in a way considered appropriate by the speaker.

[10] *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir*, ed. D. G. Mandelbaum (Berkeley, California, 1949), p. 106.

[11] A. H. Gardiner, *The Theory of Speech and Language* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 71-72.

Because Mr. Hawkins has shared his past experience with his wife, he need give her only a minimal cue of what it is he wishes to communicate to her. Not only is the word a minimal cue but it is, to anyone but his wife, highly ambiguous. The history he shares with her makes the word perfectly unambiguous and precisely communicative.[12]

Thus, in addressing a professional group the professor will employ speech that uses not only many elaborate, formal grammatical devices for signaling meaning, but also a large and diverse vocabulary. In contrast to this, in addressing intimates he will tend to use a smaller vocabulary and fewer grammatical devices for signaling structural meaning.[13]

But not everybody is a professor. Hence we cannot assume that every individual will speak in the precise manner that characterizes scientific discourse. What we must do, rather, is take scientific discourse to be one extreme and assume that any individual, professor or not, will tend on some occasions to approach more closely to that extreme than on other occasions. Every individual, then, will fluctuate between two *contrasting* extremes, one characterized by grammatical and lexical articulation and the other by grammatical and lexical simplicity. In both cases, notwithstanding the differences in speech, the function of communicating to the person addressed is adequately served; in both cases the "normality" of his speech is determined by the extent to which it is appropriate to the audience.

V

Assuming these two varieties of speech to be true of the normal individual, we must ask what the principle of that variation is. Sullivan has suggested that the form of speech "deteriorates" when the individual "becomes cut off from integration with other more or less real people."[14] This remark has some relevance in the context of schizophrenia, but we must notice that the speech of the normal person "deteriorates" precisely *because* he is integrated with other people and takes their understanding into account, because he realizes he does not have to speak formally in order to make himself understood. If successful communication be taken as "integration," then the normal individual integrates himself with the person he addresses in each of the extreme instances in spite of the "deterioration" of speech at one extreme.[15]

Given the assumption that the normal person takes the understanding of his auditor into account, the essential factor underlying his variations in speech seems to lie in a sociological rather than a psychological view. What appears to vary in the two extremes is the character of the audience he addresses rather than any state within the speak-

[12] The pragmatic criterion of ambiguity proves, therefore, not to be whether *anyone* happens to understand an utterance, but rather whether the person actually addressed by the speaker understands. In the usual use of the term "ambiguity," it is implicitly assumed that utterances are addressed to society at large and thus should be understood by anyone.

[13] It may be said that the movement from formal to informal is towards "pure predicativity," or perhaps more objectively, towards dropping the "function" or "articulatory" words. This means that the statistical frequency of such grammatical devices as prepositions, conjunctions, articles, and auxiliaries will decrease as speech becomes less formal.

It is of interest to theories of psychosis that schizophrenic speech appears to have the same grammatical characteristics as those of normal, informal speech.

[14] H. S. Sullivan, "The Language of Schizophrenia," in *Language and Thought in Schizophrenia*, ed. J. S. Kasanin (Berkeley, California, 1946), p. 9.

[15] If the individual's speech does not "deteriorate" in an informal situation, we consider him stuffy or pompous.

er himself. In one situation the individual is addressing an audience typically composed of a large number of people; in the other he addresses one person or a small circle. In one situation he addresses an audience that is formal, impersonal, and eminently public in character; in the other he addresses an audience that is highly informal, intimate, and eminently private.

The size of the audience may be taken to be a rough index of its heterogeneity with respect to the speaker himself: the more people there are, the more probable it is that the past experience of one will differ from that of another. In this sense, the larger the audience the less possible it is that its members will share the highly complex understandings that presuppose extensively shared experience. Conversely, the smaller the audience the more possible is it that it can consist of people who are on intimate terms with the speaker, who have shared a great deal of experience with him, and who have already arrived at a complex set of common understandings with him.

The size of the audience is, of course, only an index; it limits possibilities but it does no more. What is important is the character of the audience, no matter what the size. Insofar as he perceives the audience to stand in a highly intimate relation to himself, the individual will speak to it in the way that has been described. This intimacy in turn normally presupposes the sharing of many complex understandings. Insofar as such understandings are shared between speaker and auditor, to that extent successful communication can take place on the basis of very simple verbal signals.

This matter of common understandings may be put in more objective terms. The life of an individual may be treated as a series of conversations with others over time, while his intimacy with another at any point in time may be defined as a relationship resting upon a great number of past conversations.[16] In this sense, to the extent that the speech of an individual demonstrates formal characteristics at any point in time, to that extent his speech depends for its communicative meaning on a relatively small amount of past conversation with his audience; to the extent that the speech of an individual demonstrates the characteristic terseness of intimacy at any point in time, to that extent his speech depends for its communicated meaning on a relatively large number of past conversations with his audience.

This aspect of speech variation also occurs in any single conversation. When we begin talking to someone about "the big black dog that's snarling a few feet away," as soon as the character of the reference is established, we lapse into "he" or "it" without being at all obscure so far as the person who heard the original reference is concerned, while someone who had not heard the reference might become puzzled. When one is among intimates, the character of what one refers to in a good deal of his speech has already been established in the remembered past that speaker and auditor both share; but when one addresses strangers, the character of what one refers to must be established before the strangers will understand.

On such a level as this we can suggest one possible continuum, running from speech-situations in which the speaker would tend to share the least amount of experience with his auditor to those in which he tends to share the most; and along this continuum we

[16] Professor Kenneth Pike suggested this in a personal conversation.

should expect changes to occur in the individual's speech. With respect to spoken speech, we may postulate the following possibilities ranging from that which should elicit the most highly articulated speech to that which should elicit the most simplified: speaking publicly to a large audience; speaking to a small audience of strangers; face-to-face conversation with a stranger; face-to-face conversation with friends; face-to-face conversation with members of one's family; conversation with oneself when one is not consciously formulating speech for the purpose of communicating to others.[17] In the case of written speech, possibilities would follow a similar course: writing to a wide audience of strangers (as an article or book); writing a letter to a stranger; writing a letter to a friend; writing a letter to members of the family; writing notes or memos to oneself. These continua are only two out of a number of valuable possibilities. They are constructed on the basis of interpersonal relationships that imply anything from a small to a large amount of shared experience between speaker and audience. One could construct as well a continuum based on the particular type of social group addressed, ranging from what is technically called the mass to the primary group; or one could construct a continuum based on the extent to which the situation allows immediate interaction between speaker and audience.

VI

It has been noted in this paper that the vocabulary and syntax of the normal individual's speech show systematic variations best explained by referring to the character of the audience to which on any single occasion it is addressed. The normal individual adjusts his speech to his conception of the understanding of his auditors. Of course, his past experience—that is, the extent of his education in "a" language and one of its subtypes, the extent of his contact with various types of people, and the like—determines his conception of the understanding of his auditors, and it is that past experience which limits the possible variations in speech of which he is capable. All individuals, then, do not have the same range of variations, but all normal individuals have some range, the extremes of which show evident contrast in vocabulary and grammar. Whether or not he sees or understands clearly or obscurely the sociological characteristics of all the persons he addresses, those characteristics are apprehended in some fashion and underlie the range of variation in his speech.

This portrayal of the varieties of individual speech is considered a truism by the working linguist. The implications of the portrayal, however, are important. The major implication consists in the fact that if speech is in reality so flexible and variable, neither the structural characterization of "a language" by the linguist nor the mechanical characterization of speech by the mathematician or engineer can be adequate for the study of at least the more intimate varieties of individual speech.[18] In the former instance of structural analysis, "syntactic meaning," identifiable by positions in a structural frame, is more often implicit than objectively observable in concrete speech, for the frame is often lacking. In the latter instance of mathematical analysis of sequence and consequence, the fact that in any particular

[17] For conversations with one's self, see the valuable essay, L. S. Vigotsky, "Thought and Speech," *Psychiatry*, II (1939), 29-52.

[18] For a mechanical characterization of speech, see C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana, Illinois, 1949).

instance many words may be "held in mind" rather than spoken complicates the determination of the probability that one word will follow another.

Thus, actual speech emerges as neither automatic nor random in character, neither passive reflex of environment nor spontaneous efflorescence of organism. It is a type of flexible, continually adjusting behavior that, because of its interactive nature, is thoroughly social. We must not allow our heuristic abstractions of structure or probability to distort our view of the very wellspring of the abstractions. Continual awareness of what is normal and most easily overlooked—these varieties of individual speech—should test the faithfulness and value of those abstractions and sharpen their application to the abnormal.

THE VIRTUES OF CLARITY

At all hazards, Be Clear. Make your meaning, whatever it is, plain to your audience. Though obscure speech is usually due to obscure thought, this is not always so. Some persons who think clearly have not learned to express themselves clearly, because they are nervous in public, or have an insufficient command of words. In such cases it may be better to resort to the expedient, otherwise to be deprecated, of reading a speech from manuscript rather than confuse the audience. You have, moreover, to think not of the form thoughts take in your own mind, but of the form in which they will be comprehensible by your audience. Do not imitate the bishop who, preaching in a village church, told Hampshire rustics that "Nature herself shall be the palimpsest on which Omnipotence shall inscribe the characters of a rejuvenated humanity." Let the construction of your sentences be simple enough for the hearers to follow, and the words such as they cannot fail to understand. To find themselves puzzled over your meaning, and while they are still puzzling over your last sentence, to be unable to attend to the next one, annoys your hearers and lessens the chance of pleasing or persuading them. Though obscurity of expression is mostly due to obscurity of thought, it sometimes happens that people whose thought is clear enough insist on wrapping it up in vague and cloudy rhetoric. To the rule that lucidity is the first of merits, there is one exception, viz., where a speaker feels himself driven to the shelter of obscurity. I have seen astute debaters, compelled by their position to speak, unwilling to be untruthful, yet forbidden by considerations of prudence to speak out frankly all they thought, deliberately involve themselves in a web of words where each sentence seemed to have a meaning, but the hearers were left to wonder what the whole speech meant. But such contingencies are rare; you may go through life without getting caught in one.

James Bryce, "Some Hints on Public Speaking," *University and Historical Addresses* (London and New York, 1913), pp. 286-288.

WHITHER THE HUMANITIES?

Donald C. Bryant

IT is a versatile, indeed a protean, question to which we are directing our second session this afternoon. Speak it or misspeak it, the question still enjoys a wide currency, even among the thoughtful part of mankind far away from committees on the (shall I say?) "revitalization" of the curriculum. As we have it printed on our program, the question is the focus of this day's conference. Speak an "e" for the first "i" in *whither,* and we speak for our friends those priests and prophets of education who, viewing with alarm the staggering "Scientific World Picture" and the frantic compounding of ideology upon ideology, doubt that life for the conceivab'e future permits time for the humanities, doubt that we can afford the luxury of attention to the whole of man when we are so far short of securing his mere physical survival. Leave out the first "h" from "whither" and we hear ourselves joining in the lamentation of the literate over the withering from generation to generation of even the grammar and syntax, not to speak of the dialectic and rhetoric, of humanistic study.

Now, there is a kind of pessimism in the mere raising of these questions, *whither? whether?* and *wither?* We do not call diagnostic conferences such as this one over what is vigorous and secure. The humanities must be in trouble, or in default, or we wouldn't be bothered. On the other hand, as Aristotle said in his *Rhetoric,* neither do men argue over what cannot be otherwise. So, therefore, let us in good heart and conscience strive to restate some apparent truths about the humanities. Let us see whether we can agree, in a very few minutes, perhaps on whither they are going, but more especially on what they must contribute to the education of generations which we should like to see arise to participate in subsequent conferences on "The *Humanistic* World Picture and the *Sciences.*"

Perhaps I sound presumptuous. I hope not. I am not likely to offer anything which will appear to you essentially new. It seems to me, however, that one of the fruits of humanistic study is the realization that, though one strictly new idea per age or generation is a high yield, old ideas must be reformulated, must be reconceived, again and again. Furthermore, a new or different expression of an idea is in effect a new idea; and without new or fresh expression an idea probably ceases to be an idea at all and degenerates into an element in an ideology.

What *are* these humanities whose "whither" we are pursuing? No doubt Dr. Kessler[1] will settle our amicable disputes with the munitions of semantics. Until his turn comes, however, I should like to make an operating distinction: I do not mean to talk of the *works* of the arts and sciences. Whither

Donald C. Bryant (Ph.D., Cornell, 1937) is Professor of Speech and English at Washington University in Saint Louis and Editor-Elect of the QJS. *This paper was read as one of four contributions to a symposium occupying one session of a conference on* The Scientific World Picture and the Humanities, *at Washington University, October 14, 1955.*

[1] John J. Kessler, Editor of *Semantika,* who read a paper later in the symposium to which this present article was presented.

literature, art, music, history, and science are going, I am sure that I cannot predict. The resources of the human spirit cannot be foretold, or weighed and measured in advance. They can only be apprehended with surprise and delight when they are manifested. And that is as it should be. We *can* speculate with some profit, however, on the future of the *study* of the works of the arts and sciences; and that is what I propose to try.

I like the scope given to the humanities by a wise scholar and teacher, my old friend Dean Hunt of Swarthmore. He says that "the 'humanities' embrace whatever contributes to freedom in making enlightened choices." "An enlightened choice," he adds, "is a choice based upon a wide knowledge of all the alternatives, but knowledge about the alternatives is not enough. There must be imagination to envisage all the possibilities, and sympathy to make some of the options appeal to the emotions and powers of the will."[2] This is by no means a definition, and I do not offer it as one; but it seems to me to generate an atmosphere in which it may be profitable to go ahead.

Men do not live by facts, nor by facts and logic, though they prefer to think they do; and when we contemplate the monstrosities of fantasy and fraud launched upon the public by propaganda and advertising, many of us wish that what *we* call facts and logic had a more powerful part in restraining and motivating mankind. Nor do men live by abstract principle derived from fact and logic, though without fact, and logic, and principle, our ability, as William James said, "to scent out human excellence or to divine it among its accidents" is so whimsical as to be useless.

No, men live by what they *create* from the facts, the logic, the principle. They live by what they *do* with what they know and understand, by what they *make* of what they apprehend and believe. These are the ideas, the intellectual and perhaps ethical conceptions, which we generate and incarnate through the discipline of study, in an active synthesis of intellect, imagination, emotion, and will. And these I call, in the high, traditional, poetic sense of the term, the fictions men live by—those imaginative inventions which since Plato and Aristotle at least have been identified as the unique, constructive ideas of all true works of the fecund human spirit. Conversely, the frauds we live under are those *ersatz* ideas, those sterile, robot structures, those facile ideologies, which we too often embrace through pseudo-thought, ignorance, and impotence as substitutes for the struggle of creation.

The fictions we live by and the frauds we live under—how tell the one from the other? Well, how tell a *Hamlet* from an *East Lynn* or a *Picnic*? A William Lloyd Garrison or a Sam Adams from a McCarthy?

All serious studies may promote, though not certainly guarantee, the surer construction of fictions worth living by and a keener detection of the frauds which paralyze the human spirit. It seems to me, however, to be the special province of the study of the nonverbal arts and of language, literature, rhetoric, philosophy, and history to promote these ends, because the ultimate concern of these studies is man at his best in his *total, live, relevant context.*

Since I have included philosophy and history in this list, contrary to the reigning formulas of curricular strategists, perhaps I should explain. I am thinking of philosophy as it views the mind in

[2] Everett Hunt, "Rhetoric as a Humane Study," *QJS*, XLI (1955), 114.

the context of the universe; and I am thinking of history especially as it views men in the context of men and ideas and events, making and failing to make free and enlightened choices; showing or not showing adequate knowledge of all the alternatives, imagination enough to envisage all the possibilities, and sympathy enough to make some of the options appeal to the emotions and powers of the will.

To apply further in concrete detail the ideas which I have been stating would be a long, and I fear not very lucrative, process. They are old ideas, refurbished, if I have been fortunate, with perhaps some novelty of statement; and that statement will have meaning in itself or not at all. But let me for a few minutes approach a little less obliquely the original question, "Whither the humanities?"

The answer as I conceive it lies, in part at least, in another question, "Whither the need?" And the needs will lie in much the same places where they have lain, though ever in changing degrees of severity.

Greater and greater will become the need, as our life grows more complex, more frantic, and more mechanical, for that special excitement which comes with the discovery of the new, more satisfying world of the imagination, nearer, as Bacon said, to the heart's desire—that is, for the enjoyment and appreciation of the arts, the least contested field of the humanities.

Perhaps a more pressing need at present and for the visible future, for it arises from a greater deficiency, lies in the fundamental use of language—in the rudiments of efficient and versatile communication. The frauds we suffer under from the huckster and shyster, from the religious and political medicine men, and from the well-meaning social (and even educational) incompetents, derive much of their strength from the merely *superficial* familiarity of our educated citizens with the live use of language, for good and for ill, over the years and the centuries. In humanistic study especially, though of course not exclusively, should lie the most powerful antidote, for example, to the sorry popular notion, abetted, alas, by multiple-choice verbal-aptitude tests, that a synonym is a definition—that *inebriate, communist, subversive, security risk, homosexual,* and *incompetent* all mean *undesirable,* and, therefore, all mean approximately the same thing, and are interchangeable; that *dis*loyalty and *dis*agreement must be equivalents because both begin with *dis.* Furthermore, a sustained critical experience with language from its best to its worst in literature and philosophy, and from its greatest to its meanest in the statesmen and demagogues, the saints and satans, of history, would seem the firmest counterbalance to the penury of an idiom in which *supercolossal* has become a diminutive, and there are no resources left for true moderation or even, strangely enough, for extravagance.

In addition to pursuing their age-old devotion to the rudiments of resourceful communication, the humanities, I think, will revive their traditional concern with man trying through language to make up the minds of his fellows and to determine their behavior. In other words, I think that rhetoric will reassume its traditional place beside poetic in the humanistic studies. I do not suggest that this study would be any less than it is at present the concern of scientific psychology, semantics, statistics, sociology, and cultural anthropology. I do strongly suggest that that which is the peculiar province of humanistic study—the phenomenon in its *total, rel-*

evant, live context—will be slighted by students of language, literature, the graphic arts, and even music only at great peril to a dynamic comprehension of ourselves as we are and as we should like to be.

You see, I appear to come round again and again to the idea of total, relevant, live context as the special object of the humanities—as the background against which free and enlightened choices will be made so that fictions rather than frauds may prevail. And totality, relevance, and liveness of experience are central qualities in art—of a Shakespeare, a Proust, a Daniel Webster, a Henry Moore, or a Picasso. That is why, for example, the humanities must never concede that a day in the psychiatric ward, even followed by a tour of Elsinore Castle conducted by the best social scientist in Denmark, is an adequate *substitute* for a semester with *Hamlet;* that any amount of political, economic, or sociological data can render obsolete Hogarth's paintings of eighteenth-century London.

If I have suggested some of the proper ends of humanistic study, or perhaps of the whole of liberal education, will what we call the humanities do their full share to realize those ends? I think it possible, but there are signs that they may not. Some proper concerns of the humanities seem to be going by the board, or, in the jurisdictional maneuvers of academic fence-building, to be moving by default and piecemeal to the social sciences. I mean, for example, the study of the dynamics of controversy, of propaganda and the operational logic of public address. This is indeed a social study, but it demands not only the application of science, but of the humanistic concepts as well. Let us point to another sort of example. The humanities have been showing discouraging symptoms, at least in the approach to poetry and art, of fearing the intellect, of declaring idea and thought irrelevant, someone else's province, if not actually destructive to the fine activity of imagination and emotion. The implications of this tendency are carefully exposed by Lionel Trilling in his essays on "Reality in America," and "The Meaning of a Literary Idea." To love reason and to value its limitations, to prize emotion but resist control by it in despite of reason, to cultivate imagination and cope with its aberrations, must remain the doctrine of the humanities. This doctrine demands the discipline of study, but that discipline tends too often to yield to the blander exercise of spontaneous response.

Finally, it seems to me unfortunate, as you have gathered, that an estrangement, even, it seems, a legal separation, has come between the humanities and history, though the arts and philosophy as studies, unlike the sciences, are feeble without history, and history sterile without philosophy and the arts. Mr. Truman's discourses upon history in his *Memoirs* are, no doubt, unphilosophical and simplistic, but they point, at least, to the worth of historical context in the making of contemporary decisions.

If the necessity of abiding with patience in a climate of unresolvable doubts, and retaining still the power of critical judgment in undemonstrable matters, is the destiny of rational and intelligent humanity, if we must achieve a domestication to human error and confusion, and retain at the same time the excitement of discovering human possibilities in the resources of the imagination, then it must be the future of the humanities to keep bringing new life to the total, relevant context of free and enlightened choices.

THE *DE ARTE RHETORICA* OF CYPRIAN SOAREZ, S. J.

Lawrence J. Flynn, S.J.

I

ALTHOUGH his name has appeared in surveys of rhetoric, Cyprian Soarez is to most students no more than a word. Yet this sixteenth-century scholar compiled for beginners a rhetorical digest which had widespread use in hundreds of Jesuit schools from 1565 to 1773. This present article discusses the purpose, contents, and use of Soarez' *De Arte Rhetorica*[1] in the Jesuit curriculum in which it had a time-honored place.

Cyprian Soarez (1524-1593), Spanish Jesuit priest and scholar, was a contemporary of the well-known Jesuit philosopher and theologian, Francis Suarez. Joining the new religious order of Jesuits in 1549, fifteen years after its founding, he acquired a reputation as a teacher and linguist, being proficient in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Sacred Scripture, theology, the humanities, and rhetoric.[2] Drawing upon his experience as a teacher of the humanities and rhetoric, and as dean of studies in two different Portuguese schools, he wrote the *Rhetorica* in 1562. From this time until his death in 1593, little is known of him, especially of his teaching and administration. He died unaware, as were his friends, that his book would be used by hundreds of thousands of schoolboys for two hundred years in Europe and the New World, and that it would be reprinted in its original, or a modified, form more than two hundred and seven times.[3]

Father Lawrence J. Flynn, S.J., (Ph.D., University of Florida, 1955) teaches rhetoric at the Jesuit novitiate, Milford, Ohio, a division of Xavier University in Cincinnati.

[1] Hereafter cited as *Rhetorica*.

[2] In 1553 he taught rhetoric at the College of St. Anthony, Lisbon; a year later he assumed the duties of dean of studies (Francisco Rodrigues, S.J., *A Formação Intellectual do Jesuita Leis e Factos*, Pôrto, 1917, pp. 182-183). In 1555 he was transferred to the College of Coimbra to teach rhetoric (Letter of Miron to St. Ignatius, Dec. 31, 1553, found in John Alphonse Polanco, S.J., *Vita Ignatii Loyolae et Rerum Societatis Iesu, Historia*, Madrid, 1894, IV, 556). He received a master's degree in 1560, from King John III of Portugal, in recognition of his pre-eminence in rhetoric (Antonio José Teixeira, *Documentos para a Historia dos Jesuitas em Portugal*, Coimbra, 1899, pp. 201-202). Probably in 1561 he became dean of the Coimbra school (Letter of Vaz to Nadal, Nov. 23, 1561, Coimbra, found in Jerome Nadal, S.J., *Epistolae*, Madrid, 1898, I, 599). As teacher and dean, he learned much about the problem of adapting classical rhetoric to immature students.

The colleges referred to in this study correspond for the most part to modern secondary schools in America.

[3] I found that the *Rhetorica*, or a modified copy, had 207 reprintings from 1562 to 1836. A subsequent article will treat the sources and influence of Soarez' book, but it should be mentioned here that another Jesuit, Peter John Perpinian, made an official revision of it in 1565. Perpinian was a colleague of Soarez who taught the *Rhetorica* in the humanities class at the College of Coimbra. The reason why Perpinian revised Soarez' book is as follows: Soarez' varied talents were at this time occupied in teaching Sacred Scripture, theology, and languages; Perpinian had taught the humanities at Coimbra between 1557 and 1560; he was then summoned to the Roman College to teach rhetoric, where he served, in 1562-1565, on an important committee of twelve of the leading professors of the college who dealt with the early stages of what eventually became the *Ratio Studiorum*, or program of studies for all Jesuit schools; he exercised his skills of composition upon his own unfinished treatise, the *De Oratore*, 1562-1565; he was highly recommended by Alvarez, contemporary author of a famous Jesuit Latin grammar, as a man particularly equipped to write a book on oratory, and a commentary on the classics (Letter of Emmanuel Alvarez to James Lainez, July, 1564, Coimbra, found in James Lainez, *Monumenta, Epistolae et Acta Patris Jacobi Lainii secundi Praepositi Generalis Societatis Iesu*, Madrid, 1912-17, VIII, 134-135).

II

What induced Soarez to compose his book was the concern he had for students who, upon advancing to his rhetoric class, were unable to read the Latin classics with sufficient ease. In their development there appeared to be a hiatus which students passed over with difficulty. This hiatus occurred after a boy had studied grammar, and during his training in the humanities. Fundamentally, the study of the humanities was intended to develop familiarity with the language as literature. And all of these studies preceded the intensive work to be done in the rhetoric class. In other words, a student's familiarity with the mechanics of grammar was never a guarantee of his facility in reading Quintilian, Cicero, Virgil, Sallust, and the other authors.

As a teacher of rhetoric, Soarez knew that this problem existed. But his hopes for a simple solution were jarred when he turned to the classics. Among the traditional rhetoricians he found no books which seemed to be written for the purpose of gradually introducing a student to the principles of oratory and to involved orations. His analysis of this deficiency in the classics follows:

> . . . there was no book of ancient writers which opened the first door to eloquence for eager youth. The reason for their [Jesuit teachers'] disappointment was not the fact that the theory of speaking had scant light shed upon it in Latin writings, for Quintilian at one and the same time treated the subject with the utmost care and learning.[4]

One after another he mentions the classical rhetorics and their inadequacy with respect to his objective:

Institutiones Oratoriae

> Admittedly, as I have said, these were written with the utmost care, unusual judgment, and consummate erudition; however, they are so long and at the same time so obscure that they demand greater leisure and keener judgment.

Partitiones Oratoriae

> . . . these are so short and concise that they too narrowly abridge many splendid resources of eloquence that have been assembled and compressed.

De Oratore

> . . . quickly pass[es] over techniques of lesser moment but especially essential for learners.

De Inventione

> . . . [the two books] do not teach how to polish and arrange a speech . . . they do not disclose the sources of invention pointed out by Aristotle. And so there are many precepts in these books which Cicero himself found fault with in works published later.

Ad Herennium

> . . . [books] contain certain information on *status* and much on the embellishment of speech and of thought, different from what Cicero and Quintilian taught on the same subjects.

Cicero's *Topica*

> . . . has examples drawn from a profound knowledge of law, which are so difficult that their obscurity repels many people from reading it.

Orator

> . . . runs through summarily or almost omits very many of the ordinary rules which are particularly useful for students eager to learn to speak.

If this were true of the classics, perhaps the kind of book which Soarez envisioned was still to be written. He wanted a compendium of the rules of rhetoric with suitable illustrations, so that students could learn the essentials before entering the class in rhetoric, in which they would make a comprehensive and detailed study. His fellow-teachers shared this objective, as he remarked:

> For this reason, our [Jesuit] teachers desired to collect all the elements of eloquence in some book, method, and plan; to explain these with definitions and to illustrate them with examples from the teachings of Aristotle; in the case of Cicero and Quintilian to include not only their teaching but usually their very words. For they thought that if this were done the pupils would learn, along with the ordinary rules of rhetoric, those more refined points

[4] This and the following critiques are from the preface to the reader, here referred to as "Introduction I." My translation.

which involve the topics for arguments, the amplification of ideas, and the form and rhythm of an oration.[5]

Thus, Soarez' purpose was to streamline and sharpen important details as well as to acquaint beginners with short, pat passages from the great orators and poets. Mindful of this aim, he shamelessly lifted words, phrases, clauses, and even paragraphs from classical sources. Since Cicero's speeches are replete with illustrations of rhetorical principles, Soarez provided suitable passages from many of them and indicated marginal references to others. Intending to simplify the classics for beginners, he siphoned off portions of rules and definitions, often couching them in their original language. His attitude appeared to be that if the beginner needs a diet, let him have choice morsels of the best food available.

But if familiarity with classical authors had been Soarez' only purpose, he would have moved counter to his theory of education—a theory in which learning and good morals are of primary, but not equal, importance; in which learning is viewed not as an end in itself, but as a means to a higher and more virtuous life on earth, which, in turn, is a preparation for the fuller existence in another, better world. He expressed this complete objective in these words: ". . . we have no desire more urgent than that you possess every grace and scholarship and thus be pleasing to the source and salvation of our life, Christ Jesus."[6]

Since Soarez had dedicated his life to this concept of liberal, Christian education, we can understand how he came to conceive the study of rhetoric as an aid to that ultimate objective. For him there had to be a blend of humanistic and Christian elements, but the humanistic must always be imbued with the higher Christian element and must progress toward, never away from, the Christian concept of true education. Christian morality condemns practices and attitudes such as he specifically excludes from his treatment of rhetoric.

Let license in the matter of lying, then, be banished, that license which is sternly forbidden by divine law, but which Quintilian and ancient teachers of oratory allow a speaker. Check all boldness and the disgraceful fault of tearing others to pieces by infamous, insulting, and abusive language, which I could wish Demosthenes and Cicero had not indulged so much. Let pride and the hankering for vain praise which blunts keenness of mind be pruned away. Let it be understood that it is wicked to envelop an audience in darkness so that they do not perceive the truth; or by speaking, to corrupt their decisions and their way of thinking, which was done time and again by Greek and Roman orators.[7]

Thus by means of the classics Soarez hoped to inculcate intellectual and moral ideals, purify them by Christian directives, and keep them elevated above pagan abuses. The vast reach of this noble objective far exceeds the grasp of his tiny compendium. But in the experienced hands of qualified teachers of the classics, men whose lives mirrored their Christian ideals, much would be done. The author conceived his book as a means for enabling students to bridge the gap between theory and practice—the gap between their knowledge of Latin grammar and a facility in reading Latin masterpieces, as well as the all-important gap between their knowledge of the Christian philosophy of life and faithful adherence to this philosophy.

III

Soarez synopsizes the *Rhetorica* in "Introduction II":

[5] "Introduction I."
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] From a second preface to the *Rhetorica*, referred to as "Introduction II." My translation.

> In the first book, which concerns invention, sixteen topics for arguments are explained, and at the same time the matter suitable for arousing hearers is extracted from them. Certain rules are also set forth, adapted to embellishment and deliberation [demonstrative and deliberative speaking].
>
> The second book, which contains rules for arrangement, discusses the divisions of a speech, the *status*, judgment, and the kind of dispute which arises over the meaning of a writing. Also, syllogistic reasoning, enthymeme, induction, and example are treated. Besides, since ancient writers frequently refer to the epichirema, sorites, and dilemma, the effectiveness of these is explained.
>
> Finally, the third book shows the embellishment of speech contained in words, either individually or taken together. It also discusses new and rare words, tropes, ornaments of words and of thoughts; the origin, cause, nature, and use of well-knit metrical prose; and finally, it treats memory and delivery.

Accordingly, Book I, on invention, includes sixteen topics for proof and the rules for amplification. This book embraces fifty-six chapters which extend over sixty pages of the duodecimo edition. Book II, on arrangement, contains twenty-seven chapters in thirty-four pages. Expression, in Book III, embraces twelve tropes, twenty figures of speech, twenty-five figures of thought, prose rhythm, memory, and delivery. Almost as lengthy as Books I and II combined, Book III includes fifty-eight chapters of uneven length, and fills eighty-seven pages. Memory and delivery are limited to four and three chapters respectively.

A quality that distinguishes this digest from many other Renaissance primers is the peculiar continuity it achieves. This quality develops from marshaling definitions, rules, and examples into a continuous, connected discourse that binds together many borrowed passages. Sometimes, the continuity arises from the borrowed passage itself, a select rhetorical morsel which Soarez took verbatim from the excellent cuisine of Cicero or Quintilian. Page after page often discloses Soarez' judicious and felicitous combination of classical morsels, set forth on the student's dinner plate. His palatable seasoning and deft arrangement of classical victuals are devised to effect a wholesome and attractive repast. Transitional phrases and sentences, though somewhat stilted, add a colorless but useful continuity which blends together the borrowed members of his rhetorical doctrine.

If there had been no previous digests of classical principles and illustrations, we might say that Soarez contributed an original method of presenting classical doctrine. The fact is that there had been earlier books of this kind. Being a teacher, he was interested in composing a primer for Jesuit schools, a handbook designed to make students of the humanities familiar with certain classical principles and excerpts, before they entered the class in rhetoric. As a result, his book has that kind of originality which comes from a capable compiler who, after scanning and digesting classical rhetoric, paraphrases, excises, or reproduces verbatim what he considers suitable.

Composition that depends so completely upon eclecticism of sources cries loudly for an originality in the compiler's style, and Soarez generated more than one stream of delightful sparks in welding together classical passages verbatim.[8] In rare instances he is likely to commence a sentence with the words of Cicero and conclude it with those of

[8] Perpinian had a limited share in the originality of those printings of the *Rhetorica* which stem from his revision of 1565. However, his work consisted of minor deletions or additions, chiefly of words and phrases, so that after a careful analysis of the original and the revised editions, we can safely say that Perpinian's contribution to the *Rhetorica* was slight. If he had had sufficient time, he could have left a significant imprint upon the book, so thorough was his scholarship and interest in rhetoric.

Quintilian, without indicating any sources. Naturally, he is careful to make grammatical and syntactical adjustments so as to produce complete sentences, despite their borrowed elements. Occasionally he transfers an excerpt to a different context, but for the most part he sensibly and neatly manages to arrange phrases and sentences from the classics into the pattern of his rhetorical digest.

Blending into a single sentence passages from different writers is not his customary procedure. His paragraphs may be developed by coupling various phrases or sentences gleaned from different sources. For instance, the predominant thought may be based upon a definition from Cicero's *Topica* or the *Ad Herennium,* expanded by a pertinent comment from the *Partitiones Oratoriae,* clarified by citing a principle from Cicero's other rhetorical writings, and finally illustrated by a portion of a Ciceronian speech or a verse from the *Aeneid.*

At as late a date as the first printing of the *Rhetorica,* 1562, the prevailing carelessness among authors and printers in the use of marginal source references left much to be desired for accuracy. Soarez' reliability in indicating sources is no small tribute to his thoroughness. Obviously, his copious marginal notes could not begin to disclose all the roots of his borrowed sources. And although a beginner was not expected to recognize the excerpts, his teacher was. Upon the latter, who would have to be a master of the classics, devolved the duty of teaching the *Rhetorica* and the parent classics effectively. Actually, at this stage of the curriculum, a student was not expected to discern the exact words of Cicero, Quintilian, and the others. For paramount in his development was familiarity with their ideas, definitions, rules, and examples, many of which Soarez presented in their own words.

What is remarkable about this scissors-and-paste digest is the praiseworthy result—a complete, condensed handbook of rhetoric with appropriate definitions, rules, and illustrations. Small wonder, then, that occasionally a reader has to fight the meaning up, across, and down a wrinkle of paste, or smooth out his mental impressions from roughly cemented edges of the text. Impressed with such a tightly condensed handbook of classical rhetoric, the reader is more apt to indulge Soarez, whose efforts to reproduce the thoughts and exact words of classical geniuses, as faithfully and as compendiously as possible, now and then brush up against our notions of unity and coherence.

IV

The primary step in the Jesuit program of studies was the trivium of grammar, humanities, and rhetoric. In some instances, an introductory class in fundamentals preceded the first or lowest class in grammar.[9] This, however, was not customary and was never tolerated in the Roman College, the prototype of Jesuit schools, without the permission of the General of the Jesuits. Usually, there were three levels in the grammar class alone: lower, middle, and upper. Promotion depended upon progress; grammar could be completed within three years, even though in some schools there were as many as nine *gymnasia* for the grammar class alone. The goal of this study was the ability to write and speak Latin correctly and with some sense of *elegantia.* Considered as a unit,

[9] The next three paragraphs are chiefly a summary made from an authoritative study of early Jesuit educational activities, the *Monumenta Paedagogica Societatis Iesu quae primam Rationem Studiorum anno 1586 editam praecessere* (Madrid, 1901), "Document 10," pp. 107-140. Hereafter cited as *Mon. Paed.*

these grammar classes correspond to our primary and secondary schools.

The next stage in the trivium was the humanities class which concentrated on language as literature. Accordingly, style, poetry, and the study of Greek were cultivated, although in certain instances Greek was commenced in the grammar class. As in the study of grammar, a student's progress was the determining factor in promotion to higher studies. In general, the humanities covered a two-year program which roughly parallels our present freshman year of college.

In the rhetoric class, the final stage of the trivium, the objective was *eloquentia perfecta*. At the Roman College, one hour each day was assigned for learning the precepts of oratory, another for studying the authors, and a third for Greek. Though the schools varied in their daily distribution of time and the relative emphasis given to precepts and practice, all of them attempted to prepare a student of rhetoric to express himself with a certain degree of stylistic distinction.[10]

Composed as a handbook, the *Rhetorica* could be used satisfactorily in the humanities or the rhetoric class. This book circulated in Portuguese and Spanish schools, and eventually appeared in other Jesuit schools throughout Europe, prior to the 1599 *Ratio*.[11] Until this date, it had received no official Jesuit recognition, and consequently, it was not officially recommended for use in any specific class. At the College of Evora it was taught in the lowest grammar class.[12] In 1563 the colleges of Coimbra, Evora, Lisbon, and Braga used it in the humanities class.[13] At the College of Cologne, the curriculum for 1566-1567 assigned it to the humanities class taught by a certain Father Jacob. Two years later, this professor was still using it in the same class, while a Father Conrad's schedule called for a repetition of Soarez in the rhetoric class.[14] Teachers at the Roman College taught Soarez, or the *Ad Herennium*, from Easter until the end of the school year in August.[15]

It is clear that certain schools were experimenting with Soarez' book in the classes of grammar, humanities, and rhetoric. We can reasonably suppose that what these schools did in regard to the adoption of the book, others did also, until the 1599 *Ratio* assigned it to a particular class.

James Ledesma, a key figure in drafting basic regulations that led to the 1586 *Ratio* and were likewise valuable in subsequent revisions, discouraged tampering with Soarez' text. Addressing

[10] A fuller treatment of Jesuit instruction in the humanities and rhetoric included other pedagogical methods: contests between class members; public demonstrations of skill in dialectics and forensics at stated intervals when all students had to be ready to participate; academies or extracurricular activities of a classical, literary, scientific, or oratorical nature, for the more capable students and under a faculty moderator. To some extent, these academies resembled literary societies of the nineteenth century. As early as 1557, at both Perugia and Genoa, there were clear indications of incipient Jesuit academies. Soarez himself coached students in an oratorical organization which was an immediate forerunner of the academies (Letter of Miron to St. Ignatius, Dec. 31, 1553, referred to in Polanco, *op. cit.*, IV, 524).

[11] The *Ratio Studiorum*, or program of Jesuit studies, is designed to give purpose, method, and organization to courses taught in the humanities, philosophy, and theology, in all Jesuit schools. Intended as an enduring framework of objectives, it has undergone revisions, notably in 1591, 1592, 1599, and 1832. See Allan P. Farrell, S.J., *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education, Development and Scope of the Ratio Studiorum* (Milwaukee, 1938), Chs. VII, VIII, X, XV; also, George E. Ganss, S.J., *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University* (Milwaukee, 1954), Ch. X.

[12] John Alphonse Polanco, S.J., *Chronicon Societatis Iesu* (Madrid, 1889-1894), III, 424.

[13] *Mon. Paed.*, pp. 695-697.

[14] G. M. Pachtler, S.J., *Ratio et Institutiones Scholasticae Societatis Iesu per Germaniam olim vigentes* (Berlin, 1887-1894), I, 232-234.

[15] *Mon. Paed.*, p. 437.

certain teachers of the humanities class who were to use Soarez, or the *Ad Herennium,* he told them in substance: Retain these precepts without making additions, unless it be some rule mentioned only in passing or some further explanation; do not dictate another system of rhetoric in class, nor change the order of this one.[16]

Although only one official revision was made of Soarez' book (1565), the changes being of a minor nature, there were certain variations in the presentation of matter in class.[17] The College of Avignon is a case in point. There, the professor of the humanities class explained Book III of the *Rhetorica* in the first semester. Concurrently he was to exercise the students in a *chria,* a composition that enlarged upon a dictum, and in other exercises in composition. Then in the second semester he treated Books I and II. The Musée Calvet possesses a copy of an edition (1580) of Soarez in which a student, one Alexandre Gallifet, inscribed notes received from his teacher, Père Columbat.[18] These notes indicate that the professor read to his class the original texts of Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero. He also rounded out explanations of Soarez' rules with numerous examples from ancient writers. Undoubtedly, this was the usual method of teaching Soarez in class, the professor supplementing the text with a much fuller treatment of classical materials.

The *Rhetorica,* therefore, was evidently an instrument for breaking difficult ground for the beginner. Accordingly, teachers used it in several different grammar classes, and in the humanities or the rhetoric class. But as the movement toward a uniform code of studies grew, the *Rhetorica* eventually found its place in the humanities class. This was determined by the 1599 *Ratio* on the basis of reports from hundreds of schools where it had been in use.

Explicit mention of Soarez' rhetoric in the 1599 *Ratio* was an important factor in its growing popularity. Prior to 1575, in his program of studies devised for the Roman College, Ledesma recommended the *Ad Herennium* and Cicero's *De Inventione,* or "the rhetoric of Cyprian."[19] The 1586 *Ratio,* a trial program, borrowed heavily from Ledesma's plan, as did subsequent revisions. Although the 1586 and 1591 *Ratio* do not directly mention Soarez, the omission itself is not a sign of disapproval. When officials of the Jesuits issued the definitive 1599 *Ratio,* they incorporated Soarez' rhetoric in the program of studies imposed upon the schools.

This 1599 *Ratio* explicitly refers to Soarez in several places. Mention occurs in a recommended, but not obligatory, time schedule for the humanities class:

> ½ hr. On alternate days reading of historical author and exercise in versification (second half of year, rhetorical principles from Soarez).[20]

Certain rules for the professor of the humanities class, incorporated into the 1599 *Ratio,* likewise refer to Soarez. There is to be "a short summary of rhetorical rules from Cyprian [which] will be taught, naturally, in the second semester."[21] Another reference states that "something from the third book of Cyprian" is to be studied in the second

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 437.

[17] Perpinian's revision was chiefly stylistic and, to a limited extent, supplementary. More radical alterations occurred later, always bearing Soarez' name. They appeared as condensations under the title of *Compendium,* or *Synopsis,* or *Summa,* or *Tabulae,* etc.; there was even an expanded modification called the *Manuale.*

[18] Marcel Chossat, S.J., *Les Jésuites et Leurs Oeuvres à Avignon, 1553-1768* (Avignon, 1896), pp. 296-298.

[19] *Mon. Paed.,* p. 171.

[20] Farrell, *op. cit.,* p. 346.

[21] Pachtler, *op. cit.,* II, 414.

hour during the vacation period.[22] Finally, a directive in the common rules for professors of lower classes of grammar includes a passing reference to Soarez.[23] This recommends that the teacher occasionally read, by way of introduction to the classics, some passages from Soarez' rhetoric, from poetry, and from Greek and Latin grammar, with a view to verifying rules.

Even after promulgation of the definitive 1599 *Ratio,* inquiries and criticisms continued to pour into headquarters in Rome. Such information, collected in manuscripts under the title "Documenta de Ratione Studiorum, 1583-1613," consists of questions and, in some instances, of replies that were supplied by an unknown scribe, apparently a secretary with some authority at Rome. One of these inquiries again raises the question, In which class should the *Rhetorica* be used? The scribe's reply is subjoined:

The deputies for Spain note that it is customary to study the *Rhetorica* of Cyprian Soarez in the class in rhetoric. The Province of Andalusia notes the same.

Reply: It is to be studied in the class in humanities.[24]

Those Jesuits, then, responsible for the 1599 *Ratio,* apparently determined to anchor the *Rhetorica* in the humanities class where it was to serve as a preparation for the formal study of rhetoric. In view of Soarez' observation in "Introduction I" that students needed a primer before commencing work in his rhetoric class, he must have thoroughly approved the *Ratio's* assignment of his book.

Finally, when the 1599 *Ratio* was again revised in 1832, the new draft contained no reference to Soarez, since his book was no longer in common use at the time. After all, it had enjoyed explicit official approval in the Jesuit program of studies for more than two hundred and thirty years. Following this program, Jesuit schools the world over used it during this period, and innumerable boys first learned rhetoric from its pages.

[22] *Ibid.,* p. 418.
[23] *Ibid.,* p. 390.
[24] "Documenta de Ratione Studiorum, 1583-1613," MS folio 590b, cited in Farrell, *op. cit.,* p. 329.

IT IS THE BEST SPEECH OF THE BEST SOUL

Eloquence, like every other art, rests on laws the most exact and determinate. It is the best speech of the best soul. It may well stand as the exponent of all that is grand and immortal in the mind. If it do not so become an instrument, but aspire to be somewhat of itself, and to glitter for show, it is false and weak. In its right exercise, it is an elastic, unexhausted power,—who has sounded, who has estimated it?—expanding with the expansion of our interests and affections. Its great masters, whilst they valued every help to its attainment, and thought no pains too great which contributed in any manner to further it,—resembling the Arabian warrior of fame, who wore seventeen weapons in his belt, and in personal combat used them all occasionally,—yet subordinated all means; never permitted any talent—neither voice, rhythm, poetic power, anecdote, sarcasm—to appear for show; but were grave men, who preferred their integrity to their talent, and esteemed that object for which they toiled, whether the prosperity of their country, or the laws, or a reformation, or liberty of speech or of the press, or letters, or morals, as above the whole world, and themselves also.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Eloquence," in A. M. Drummond and E. L. Hunt, *Persistent Questions in Public Discussion* (New York & London, 1924), p. 467.

TEACHING BY DISCUSSION ON TELEVISION

H. Clay Harshbarger and Samuel L. Becker

STUDENTS of Speech acquainted with television research are aware that television can be utilized effectively for "multiplying" the teacher-lecturer or demonstrator. Studies completed for the Navy and Army and those now in progress at Pennsylvania State University, among others, have provided sufficient evidence on this score.[1] The possibility that television can be used to "multiply" a discussion leader, that is, to enlarge the discussion group without making it cumbersome, has apparently not yet been investigated. This paper presents some evidence on the feasibility of such a scheme.

Since February, 1955, the State University of Iowa has been experimenting with classes on closed-circuit television which are taught predominantly by the discussion method. The first course taught in this way was Comparative Foreign Governments, a one-semester Political Science course which meets twice a week for seventy-five minute periods. The primary purpose of this initial study was to see whether such a class could be successfully taught, and, if so, what problems would be encountered. This experiment was not controlled, and our results must therefore be evaluated with that fact in mind.

A class of eighty-seven students was divided into a studio group of fourteen, and two viewing groups of thirty-five and thirty-eight students respectively. Both of the latter groups were proctored by graduate students, while the studio group was supervised by the course instructor. The students in the studio were seated in a V-arrangement with the instructor at the apex in front of a blackboard. Name cards were provided for each student. Two cameras and four microphones were used to pick up whoever was speaking in the studio and to give reaction shots when someone was speaking from either of the other two groups. The viewing groups saw the studio proceedings on standard 21-inch television sets. When one of the students in a viewing group wanted to ask a question or participate in the discussion, he raised his hand. The proctor pressed a button which lit a small light on the instructor's desk. (There was a light of a different color for each viewing group.) The instructor indicated when he was ready for the question or comment, whereupon the proctor announced the student's

H. Clay Harshbarger (Ph.D., Cornell, 1929) is Chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at the State University of Iowa. Samuel L. Becker (Ph.D., Iowa, 1953) is Director of Television at the same university.

[1] For the Navy studies, see Robert T. Rock, Jr., James S. Duva, and John E. Murray, *Training by Television: Comparative Effectiveness of Instruction by Television, Television Recordings, and Conventional Classroom Procedures* (U. S. Department of the Navy, Special Devices Center, Port Washington, L. I., N. Y., 1951); also Robert T. Rock, Jr., James S. Duva, and John E. Murray, *Training by Television: A Study in Learning and Retention* (U. S. Department of the Navy, Special Devices Center, Port Washington, L. I., N. Y., 1951).

For the Army study, see Joseph H. Kanner, Richard P. Runyon, and Otello Desiderato, *Television in Army Training: Evaluation of Television in Army Basic Training; Technical Bulletin 14* (George Washington University, Human Resources Research Office, Washington, D. C., 1954).

For the Pennsylvania State studies, see C. R. Carpenter and L. P. Greenhill, *Instructional Television Research* (The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., July 31, 1955).

name and then handed the microphone to him. Comments from the viewing groups could be heard in the other viewing room as well as in the studio.

Since there were no traditional procedures in this situation, we felt that a second instructor behind the scenes could contribute much to the effectiveness of instruction. This instructor alternated between the two viewing rooms, listening for material developed during the discussions and potentially suitable for later tests, preparing suggestions for the discussion leader based on observations in the viewing rooms, and appraising the class performance with the discussion leader following each class meeting. The feeling of the instructors involved was that this arrangement was desirable for a class taught in this way.

There was no attempt to make a "show" of the course. No gimmicks were added. When a diagram was needed, it was drawn by the instructor on the blackboard, as when he taught the course by the conventional lecture method. There were no fancy shots nor concern with visual variety. The emphasis was on closeups of people speaking and reacting. We felt that a certain sense of intimacy was thus achieved.

As stated earlier, the primary purpose of this experiment was to see whether it was possible to teach a class in this way, and, if so, what were the problems involved. The conclusion of the political scientists and technical personnel, as well as of many other educators who viewed any of the class meetings, was that this experiment definitely showed such teaching to be feasible. The only difficult technical problem encountered was that of sound pickup from the viewing rooms. Sound was always intelligible but not always as high in quality as one would wish. We feel that this latter difficulty has now been solved through the use of a different type of microphone hung from the ceiling rather than held by the student. Other problems that arose were the usual ones found in most classes taught by discussion: some students seldom participated; some wanted to talk all of the time; some pulled the discussion far afield; and some lacked adequate preparation at times. As in other discussions, we found that a skillful discussion leader could lessen these problems.

Though this experiment was designed solely to answer the above questions, some evaluation of the effectiveness of the project may be helpful. The criteria for such an evaluation are always a problem, and the present case was no exception. Five criteria were finally selected: amount of student participation; attitude of students toward the course; stimulation of the students; amount of work required; and quality of the grades achieved.

Student participation during a sample of class days, which included approximately one-third of the semester, was high for a group of this size. Over thirty-seven per cent of the eighty-seven students registered in the course actually participated or indicated a desire to participate in the discussion on the average day. Approximately one-third of the students in each of the viewing rooms participated, or tried to, each day, while almost two-thirds of the students in the studio did so. Thirty-two per cent of the students actually participated orally each day. Again, the proportion of participating students in the studio group was approximately twice that of either of the viewing groups. Many students participated more than once during any given class period, so that there were almost twice as many student contributions to the discussions as there were participating students. The number of

student contributions was almost equal for each of the three experimental groups. (All of the percentages in this section are based on the total number of students registered in the course. If they were based on those actually in atendance each day, they would obviously be higher, as they also would be if the tabulators had caught all people who probably raised their hands. Our figures on participation are therefore minimum figures.)

When we evaluated the attitude of students toward the course, this method of teaching appeared to be popular. Seventy-two per cent of the students said that this course was as good as or better than other courses they had taken which were taught wholly or partly by the discussion method. None of the students said that this course was "much worse"; twenty-five per cent said that it was "not as good as most"; thirty-five per cent said it was "about the same"; thirty-five per cent said it was "better than most"; two per cent said it was "much better"; and the rest did not respond. When the students were asked, "If Comparative Foreign Governments was being offered next year in a number of different ways, and a friend of yours wanted to take it, which of the following would you advise him to take?" forty-two per cent said that they would advise a section taught as this one was. Eighteen per cent expressed a preference for a section taught by the discussion method in a regular classroom; thirty-six per cent preferred a straight lecture course; seven per cent wanted it on television; and twenty-nine per cent wanted it in a regular classroom.

Our third criterion was how well students were stimulated by this course as opposed to comparable lecture courses. Forty-five per cent said they were stimulated to greater thought by this course than by comparable lecture courses; thirty-two per cent felt comparable lecture courses stimulated them more; while twenty-three per cent felt they were approximately equal. These results were reversed on the question of where the students felt they learned more facts. Forty-five per cent said they learned more facts in comparable lecture courses, twenty-three per cent said they learned more in this course, while thirty-two per cent said they were about the same. Students who had been taught discussion in a Speech course tended to be more favorable toward this method of teaching than did those who had not been in a Speech course which covered discussion.

Our fourth criterion for evaluating this course was that of the amount of work it caused the students to do. Fifty-eight per cent of the students in this class said they felt it was necessary to do more preparation for this course than for comparable lecture courses they were taking. Six per cent said they had to do more for lecture courses. Thirty-five per cent said it was about the same. One student failed to respond.

Our final criterion was the time-honored one of examination grades as a means of evaluating teaching method. As we stated earlier, ours was not a controlled experiment. The instructors believe, however, that the students involved in this experiment did at least as well as students in the course have done when it has been taught in the conventional manner.

The question will be raised as to whether one could not have taken these eighty-seven students in a single room, have conducted the course in the same manner, and have achieved the same results. We have no quantitative evidence to offer on this score yet. We hope to have some in the near future.

The observations made by the instructors of the course, by ourselves, and by others who had participated in or viewed the experiment, lead to the following hypotheses: a) The instructor is brought much closer to the student in this situation than he is in a large classroom. One must see a student engrossed in watching the facial reaction of the instructor on the screen as the latter listens to this student's comments in order to appreciate the closeness that can be achieved. b) A certain group identity, or even intergroup competitiveness, can be obtained with this setup. c) The novelty of this type of class cannot be overlooked among its effects. Closed-circuit television discussions will probably never be so common that this effect will be completely lost.

Some may be interested in our opinion about the possibilities of this method for handling the "flood of students" about to engulf colleges and universities. The method is not cheap. It requires more space than a normal class, more expensive equipment, and more manpower. Its virtue is that it can multiply an effective discussion leader. Under certain conditions the problems of space, equipment, and manpower may not be as great as they first seem. If a school has a closed-circuit television system for teaching television techniques, as we do at Iowa, it can be simultaneously utilized for closed-circuit teaching of other college courses. In our case, television and political science were taught simultaneously.

Many questions arise from this type of investigation. Most important, perhaps, is the question whether our results will stand up under controlled experimental conditions. Evidence is now being obtained on this question. Another question relates to the maximum number of groups that could be included in the closed-circuit network while still retaining good participation. Whether non-participating groups would learn as much as those who actually participate is still another question. Research along these lines could provide useful information to educational administrators as well as to us in the field of Speech.

THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLE OF ELOQUENCE

What did the eloquence of Aeschines want to make it perfect? That which distinguishes the eloquence of Demosthenes, above all others, ancient or modern,—earnestness, conviction, the power to persuade that belongs to a strong and deep persuasion felt by the speaker. The old question so much discussed among the rhetoricians, whether a great orator (we do not say speaker, merely) must be a good man, must undoubtedly be answered *sub modo* in the affirmative. He must be honest, at least *quoad hoc*. He must believe in the cause he pleads. Milton, in a passage, part of which has been cited above, says, "true eloquence I find to be none but the serious and hearty love of truth"—or more properly, what the speaker believes to be the truth. This sentence ought to be engraved on the mind of every young aspirant. It is the great cardinal principle of all sound rhetoric, and is worth more than all Quintilian's twelve books put together. Faith, hope, love—the three Christian graces—are indispensable to excellence in any art—but of all arts, in oratory most. It is given to no man, be his genius or accomplishments what they may, to sway, with a real empire, great masses, with any other voice than that of *faith*, animated by hope, but above all, inflamed with zeal in his cause, and with "dearest charity," to impress his convictions on others.

Writings of Hugh Swinton Legaré (Charleston, S. C., 1846), I, 483-484.

SPEECH IN THE MARYLAND OVERSEAS PROGRAM

Loren Reid

I

MORE than 7,400 officers and men of the armed forces of the United States are now taking university-level courses as a part of the Overseas Program administered by the University of Maryland. The students meet in classes held at United States military posts at Frankfurt, Berlin, Tripoli, Paris, Naples, Ankara, Oslo, and some hundred and forty other overseas bases, stretching from Thule in Greenland to Asmara in Ethiopia. The new headquarters established this fall at Tokyo will offer courses in Japan, Okinawa, and Korea. The Program has a "campus" of more than five million square miles. Its faculty consists of more than two hundred and fifty teachers. Since the Program started with a course in Speech, since Speech has always been and still is an important part of the curriculum, and since members of the Speech Association of America have had an important part in conceiving, administering, and teaching in the Program, I should like to report on some of the principal features of this overseas enterprise.

I call the Overseas Program the educational phenomenon of this age. As an imaginative concept I rank it ahead of the founding of the American summer school and the American junior college. The summer school found a new time for education, the summer months; the junior college found a new space, the large towns and cities; the Overseas Program found both. It found a new time previously overlooked, the period of military service; and it found new space, on the bases of overseas military installations.

The Overseas Program takes its place alongside another educational concept, that the people of the several states shall maintain institutions of higher learning available at modest cost to qualified young men and women. The new concept says that these young people when in uniform shall have an opportunity to further their progress toward a university degree even while serving overseas. Tuition charges are, as a rule, even less than at many American universities; and in a large number of instances part of the charges are paid by the armed forces themselves.

This educational enterprise grows out of the recognition that we are engaged in a long, cold war. To win this war we must maintain a stalwart military posture, to use the jargon of the Joint Chiefs, and, equally important, a steadfast intellectual posture. A large part of the overseas establishment is made up of young men who are to be only temporarily in uniform. If they can continue their higher education, they can maintain and improve their habits of thinking. Another part of the military establishment is composed of career officers, commissioned and noncommissioned. A startling percentage of this group does not

Loren Reid (Ph.D., Iowa, 1932) is Professor of Speech at the University of Missouri, First Vice-President of the Speech Association of America, and Editor of Shop Talk *for the* QJS. *During the academic year 1952-1953 he taught in the Overseas Program described in this article. In 1955 he was invited back to give special courses in the Program in the London area.*

have a college degree. Already the USSR has more students enrolled in technical and collegiate courses than has the USA, showing that the enemy is alert to the necessity for trained minds. Clearly it is in the national interest for officers and men to continue their training in liberal as well as in military studies.

Although the University of Maryland was the first to establish an Overseas Program, it is today not alone in this field. Louisiana State University sends instructors to Puerto Rico, and Florida State University to Panama. The University of Hawaii and the University of Alaska serve bases in their respective areas. This is a sketchy account of the work of these other institutions, and is not a complete list, but suggests the extent today of overseas teaching.

II

Since the Overseas Program has already been written up in *Time, Newsweek, The New York Times, Christian Science Monitor, Stars and Stripes* and other periodicals, I will give only a brief historical account here.

Right now the Program is in its ninth year. In 1947 Army and Air Force officials invited the University of Maryland to offer an evening course in public speaking at the Pentagon, to meet the need of officers who found themselves being called upon to make various sorts of public speeches. Dr. Ray Ehrensberger, then chairman of the Department of Speech at Maryland, set up two sections, taught by Richard Hendricks and Edward Woods of his staff. The interest in these classes led war department officials to invite Maryland to add courses in a variety of subjects. Today Maryland runs a small college in the Pentagon, offering more than fifty different classes. From these beginnings Maryland gained teaching and administrative experience in military surroundings, so that when Pentagon officials later invited proposals for teaching overseas, Maryland could submit a plan that was feasible.

During 1949 the various details of the plan were worked out, and in October of that year seven teachers were flown from College Park, Maryland, to Germany. The blueprint called for about five hundred students, but the idea caught on so rapidly that about 1,800 enrolled for the opening session. All at once there was a shortage of books, courses, classrooms, housing, and transportation. Not so much confusion had been seen in Europe since the Battle of the Bulge. Maryland's president asked Dr. Ehrensberger to fly overseas and resolve the crisis. He recruited teachers and met numerous other contingencies; and gradually evolved an administrative organization to handle exclusively the overseas teaching.

The university division containing the Overseas Program is the College of Special and Continuation Studies, of which Dr. Ehrensberger is the dean. This office is located in College Park and has general supervision of all off-campus courses, both civilian and military, including the various centers in the District of Columbia and about forty centers in Maryland. The Overseas Program is under the direct supervision of an office in Heidelberg, staffed by a director, a registrar, a comptroller, administrative assistants, and secretaries. This office compiles teaching schedules, records student grades, arranges transportation and housing for the faculty, and handles the complex details that arise when a civilian university offers classes on military bases. A regional office located at South Ruislip, near Lon-

don, looks after similar matters for the United Kingdom.

The simple fact that, over the years, the Overseas Program has survived a host of military regulations, sudden changes in budgets, reductions in force, logistical adjustments and curtailments, and military complications that followed on the heels of treaties and international agreements, shows what rugged problems the administrative staff has met. Every one knows, for example, that our troops in Germany have been gradually pulled back from the Iron Curtain to the Rhine: Maryland teachers have moved back with their students. On one occasion a whole outfit was ordered to move from England to Tripoli. The next thing the teacher knew, he too was on a plane bound for Tripoli; in a night or two he resumed his class, out under the North African stars, until a more suitable room was available. The Austrian treaty put a sudden end to the program there. Teachers always considered Vienna a desirable assignment, but now that particular part of the overseas campus has been abandoned. As late as December, 1955, Maryland canceled classes in Nouasseur, French Morocco, because of political unrest. Nearly one hundred Air Force students and their dependents had registered for six classes of the fall term, but for the protection of its citizens the United States government imposed travel restrictions that made it impossible to continue the courses.

All of these high-echelon changes in policy affected professors of Speech as they did professors of other subjects. Still, ninety-five per cent or more of classes go on exactly as planned. In my fifteen months of teaching for Maryland I recall only five evenings that had to be rescheduled: two because of the great London fog of 1952, one because a unit was delayed in combat maneuvers, one because the base was closed on a sabotage alert, and one because the class wanted to attend the coronation of Queen Elizabeth. In each instance the class held a make-up session on a Saturday morning.

Most of the shocks are absorbed in the administrative offices; so the various disruptions do not affect many of the teachers. On the front line, besides Dean Ehrensberger, have been men like Dr. Stanley J. Drazek, associate dean of the college; Dr. Ralph J. Klein, who has taught Speech and history all the way from Goose Bay, Labrador, to Rhein Main, Germany, and who is now assistant to the dean in the College Park headquarters; Dr. A. J. Prahl, chairman of the Department of German on the College Park campus, whose knowledge of German and competence in administration made his two years as director of the Heidelberg office important ones; Dr. Mason G. Daly, who was formerly assistant director of the Program for the United Kingdom, and who is now associate director at the Heidelberg office; and more recently Brigadier General Herman Beukema, formerly on the staff of the United States Military Academy, organizer of various war department educational enterprises, and author or coauthor of more than a dozen books and monographs, currently director of the entire Overseas Program.

But to go on with the history. The original six centers of the Overseas Program were at Frankfurt, Wiesbaden, Heidelberg, Nürnberg, Munich, and Berlin; now the Program has spread all over Europe, the United Kingdom, and North Africa. Moreover, when the Northeast Air Command appealed for courses, educational centers were set up in Newfoundland, Greenland, Iceland, and Labrador. In 1950 a two-year college, of-

fering the customary courses found in the freshman and sophomore years, was established at Munich. Now the Program has expanded to the graduate level; in 1955, two hundred graduates completed a six-week term at Munich.

III

Who are the students, currently numbering more than 7,400, who enroll in these courses overseas? Most of them are members of the armed forces; a few are service-connected civilians, and wives, sons, and daughters. The officers and men perform a wide variety of military duties: they are mechanics, pilots, navigators, radar operators, instructors, and practitioners of a thousand other specialties. They work in sections concerned with supply, maintenance, intelligence, finance, transportation, public relations, plans and operations, and many other activities. They attend Maryland classes off duty: they meet two evenings a week, three hours each meeting, for eight weeks, receiving residence (not extension) credit in the amount of three semester hours. An exceptionally strong student may, with permission, take two such courses, for a total of six semester hours, each eight-week term.

Most of the students transfer their accumulated overseas course credits to home universities, taking their degrees from a wide variety of institutions as well as from the University of Maryland at College Park. One study of nearly four hundred former Overseas Program students who transferred to schools other than Maryland showed that one hundred and ten of them have already won degrees from eighty-three different institutions, twenty-two earning degrees "with distinction." The Program has now been in effect long enough, however, so that commencement ceremonies can be held overseas. In 1955 fifty-seven students were ready for their diplomas. The commencement was held in the University of Heidelberg's historic assembly hall. The Dean of the College and the President of the University of Maryland, Wilson H. Elkins, flew over to participate in the ceremonies; they were accompanied by the Governor of Maryland, Theodore R. McKeldin. Among other officials present were the mayor of the city of Heidelberg, the commanding general of the Third Air Force, Major General Roscoe C. Wilson, and the commencement speaker, the supreme commander of Allied Forces in Europe, General Alfred M. Gruenther. The fifty-seven candidates for degrees had taken their university studies at thirty different Armed Forces Education Centers. Thirty-eight of the group were in military uniform; forty-six were married, with a total of one hundred children; their average age was thirty-six; they came from twenty-two different states and the District of Columbia.

Maryland overseas students, are, as can be seen, a mature and responsible group. In their own specialties they have often attained a high degree of competence. A classroom speech involving geography, customs officials, currency and finance, cathedrals and art galleries, international politics, or military tactics or strategy invariably proves to be the springboard for a lively discussion. In many ways these students reminded me of American undergraduate groups during 1946 to 1949, when classes contained many GI's in their twenties and thirties, and even forties and fifties.

IV

The Maryland overseas faculty resembles that of any American university group. Teachers on permanent appointment are recommended by the various departments of the University at College

Park. Most of the full-time teachers have Ph.D.'s and all have teaching experience. Like any group, they have research as well as teaching interests; some of them have research projects that can be furthered by study in the great libraries and collections of London, Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, and Rome. One professor of political science became interested in Cyprus, visited the island, and launched a study of its administrative problems. A historian investigated Gladstonian foreign policy; another studied the Warren Hastings regime in India; a psychologist gathered data on problems of counselling in the armed forces. Teachers on part-time appointment are recruited locally from Rhodes scholars, Fulbright scholars, and other qualified American nationals overseas. I noted that the headquarters at South Ruislip, England, interviewed a steady stream of Americans who were abroad and who had heard about the Maryland program. A third group of faculty people consists of foreign nationals appointed to teach mathematics or language. I studied German, for example, with a young man from Nürnberg, a candidate for the doctorate in his own country, who spoke fine idiomatic English, and conducted his class with patience and skill.

V

The Overseas Program is a civilian program, and the professors are civilians. Since the teaching takes place on military bases, and since most of the students are men and women in uniform, a liaison establishment is necessary to bring together the civilian and the military aspects of this complex operation. On this side of the ocean the professors are given security clearance by the war department, and an identification card by the Adjutant General's office, which admits them to military installations. They are flown overseas by the Military Air Transport service, the famous MATS, usually landing at the Rhein-Main air base near Frankfurt; from there it is a short train ride, or auto ride on the Autobahn, to headquarters at Heidelberg. At headquarters the professor is informed about his assignment, and may find his name on military orders, issued under the authority of Headquarters, United States Army, Europe, something as follows:

> Pers listed below, University of Maryland, are auth to proceed o/a 14 apr 53 from sta indicated to new sta indicated for a pd of aprx 75 seventy-five days for purpose of teaching University of Maryland classes, and rtn.

Another paragraph will contain the magic letters TBMAA, which means that travel by military air is authorized, and "one hundred (100) lbs excess bag auth ea indiv while tvl by mil acft." Some one on the list, bound for Ethiopia, will be commanded to secure a yellow fever inoculation—all over the signature of a lieutenant general.

Eventually the "pers listed below" arrives at his new "sta" and, identity card in hand, makes his way to the base. On the base he locates the spot that will be the center of his activities—the Information and Education Office. On any military base, as every reader of this Journal knows who has done service, the I. and E. Office has the assignment of providing an educational program for the personnel of that base. It plans lectures, sponsors short courses, manages correspondence courses, at times operates a grade school and perhaps also a high school, and engages in other educational activities. This office works with University of Maryland administrative officers in setting up university-level courses. The I. and E. Officer interviews prospective students, arranges any necessary transfer of credit, and sees that they are

qualified for the courses in which they enroll. His office locates suitable classrooms, oversees the distribution and sale of textbooks and supplies, and prepares mimeographed material from time to time at the request of the professor. During the course the I. and E. Office helps absentees schedule make-up appointments, and acts as a liaison between the civilian professor and the military base in a hundred different ways. Whereas the professors come and go every eight or sixteen weeks, the I. and E. Office maintains continuity for the Program. Its advice to Maryland administrators, for example, is invaluable in determining the particular sequence of courses needed by students at that base.

VI

In September, 1952, I reported at Westover Air Base, near Springfield, Mass., for transportation by MATS to Rhein Main. (Maryland teachers now depart from McGuire Air Force Base near Trenton, New Jersey.) I had previously stopped at the Pentagon to secure identification papers, a special passport indorsement, and typhus shots, and at College Park for consultation at the office of the Department of Speech and the College of Special and Continuation Studies. At Rhein Main I cleared customs and immigration—that first year I was to cross national borders fifty times or more—turned in my U.S. money for military scrip and German marks, climbed aboard a military bus, and was soon at the Hotel Baseler Hof, in the heart of Frankfurt. Three new Maryland appointees had crossed the ocean with me; and at the Baseler Hof we ran into still other Maryland professors. Next day we received from Heidelberg new military orders covering our next assignment and authorizing military transportation thereto.

This new assignment was to attend faculty meeting in the small resort town of Bad Kissingen, some fifty miles away. We boarded a local train, and as we passed through various towns we checked them off against the timetable to make sure we knew where we were. At Bad Kissingen we were assigned quarters in the Marine Hotel, headquarters for the faculty meeting. By evening two hundred other members of the faculty and staff of the Overseas Program had arrived, and a good deal of excited conversation took place among professors who had not seen one another for several months.

Our faculty meeting, lasting the better part of two days, resembled many American meetings. We learned about the various curricula and were advised about special problems of grading, security, supply, and transportation. After the general meeting we broke up into departmental conferences, I reporting to the Speech section. Our group talked curriculum, methods, and materials like Speech teachers anywhere. Later we compared our teaching assignments: two went to the United Kingdom, one to North Africa, one to Berlin, one to Vienna. My assignment was to Nürnberg, Germany.

Next day the faculty meeting ended; twenty-four hours later we were the most distributed faculty on the planet. Two of my colleagues I did not see again until Thanksgiving, and the others I never saw again at all, for while I went to Nürnberg for eight weeks, thence to London for sixteen, thence to Burtonwood, near Liverpool, for eight weeks, and so on, they went to Heidelberg, Frankfurt, and Stuttgart; and one of them spent eight weeks at Thule, in

Greenland, the northernmost point to which the Program has penetrated.

VII

More than any other question, teachers ask, "What is teaching military personel overseas like?" Instead of detailing the actual Speech curriculum, which better belongs in another treatment, I should like to describe a few of the aspects of a single eight-week term. Any of the six terms I taught would do for the purpose, but I will choose the first.

In my mail box at Bad Kissingen I had found orders authorizing me to proceed to Nürnberg. Late the afternoon of the last day of the faculty meeting about forty of us boarded a little local train, and about six of us got off at Würzburg, an important junction point. The others left on various trains after thoughtfully filling me up to the ears with good advice and counsel; when they left I felt like a stranger in a foreign land as I stood on the platform of this battered station and surveyed the bombing damage. Eventually my train pulled in, looking as battered as the station; the engine leaked more steam than it used, but it was on time, and I was quickly in Nürnberg. I made my way without difficulty to the front of the station, and decided to ask some one where the Grand Hotel was. I stopped a passerby and on him poured out practically my entire stock of German: *"Wo ist der Grand Hotel?" "Gerade aus,"* he grunted, pointing straight across the street. And there it was, clearly and plainly labelled. Anyone could have seen it. My beginning certainly was not auspicious.

I showed the desk clerk my orders, passport, and AGO card. He assigned me to a pleasant room, my home for nine weeks. I paid 50 cents a night, then the going rate for officers; now the tariff is higher.

Next day I reported to the base, driving past the Palace of Justice, where the Nazi war criminals were tried and later hanged. The I. and E. Officer of the base told me that registration was good in my Monday-Wednesday evening class, but that since the Tuesday-Thursday class at Nürnberg had not materialized, he had given me a class on those days at Bamberg, thirty miles away. This latter class was originally set up as a course in political science, but the political science professor had not materialized; so by a deft administrative switch the course was changed to public speaking. I began to realize that I was the only University of Maryland professor in that part of the country. In fact, I *was* the University of Maryland, except for a class in German, taught by a German national on part-time appointment.

The I. and E. Officer took me around the base, showed me my classroom, arranged for me to be transported by staff car to Bamberg two evenings a week, pointed out the base library, and secured for me coffee, cigarette, and liquor ration cards. These details I hurry over.

My Nürnberg class contained twenty people: two majors, three captains, a few lieutenants and sergeants, and seven or eight enlisted men. Half a dozen members of the class were on the instructional staff of the Intelligence School located on the base. The chief of the section, a captain, enrolled in the course, and persuaded his junior officers to do likewise. A captain from the I. and E. Office was also there, plugging away toward his Maryland degree. Two civilians had enrolled: one was in charge of base transportation, and the other had been a clerk at the war trials. The Bamberg class had about the same variety of people, but was smaller in size.

I clearly recall that the first few minutes of the class seemed stiff and formal.

The pfc's were overawed by the thought of making speeches in the presence of majors. The majors were embarrassed at the idea of enduring critiques at the hands of the pfc's. In order to set both camps at ease I explained that this classroom was a part of the University of Maryland campus, that, for the three hours we were together, I would consider them all as scholars athirst for knowledge and wisdom, that, as I was a civilian, I would follow my usual practice of calling them Mr. in class, and, as I became acquainted with them, by various other names outside of class. I went on to say that I proposed to start at the beginning, assuming that no one knew anything, formally, about speech-making; and that the critiques would not be focused on personalities, but on the topic, "How can the speaker present ideas in an interesting and effective manner?" This statement cleared the air a good deal. A round of impromptu introductions cleared it still more; and the adjournment for the coffee break gave every one a chance to talk at once. When we resumed class, it was with a general feeling that the course would work out all right. At least I felt more relaxed.

What were the speeches like? We had a series of short narrative speeches, mostly about previous civilian or military activities. A few of the students talked about their home towns, located all over the continental United States. Some had had amusing military experiences. We had a round of speeches in which they talked about an aspect of their current military assignment. This shop talk was revealing to me and was enjoyed by the students. Perhaps they felt that the mission of the base was more important than they had realized. All military Speech courses need to consider the use of visual aids; so we had speeches with maps, charts, graphs, colored slides, actual objects, and mock-ups. We learned about overlays, pin-ups, colored tapes, and the strip-tease. We had persuasive speeches on current topics, and we had panel discussions. We talked about outlining, and the effective use of the voice and body. So it was much the same as any Speech class.

But it was different, too. The students were older and wiser than students back home. I noticed their maturity in various ways. There were no speeches about dates and dating, though there were eloquent discussions of whether European girls made good wives; half a dozen members of the group had married continental girls. No speeches were offered on football or school spirit, but a good many discussions were held on "What's the matter with France?" or "How can we improve Anglo-German relations?" or "Is the Schumann plan working?" or "Will Eisenhower be elected?" (Nine out of ten of them said *yes*). The students discussed good places to travel, and how to get the most for one's money. And, as one would expect in Germany, endless talks were presented on cameras and photography, but none so simple as "The camera has four parts: the lens, the shutter, the film, and the enclosing box." Words like Eastman or Brownie were never mentioned; instead, the air was filled with German names like Leica, Contax, Exacta, and the stupendous, the colossal, the bejewelled Linhof Teknica. When I confessed to having crossed the ocean with a mere Argus C3, twenty students shook their heads in profound sorrow.

They also showed their maturity in the casual way in which they struck up friendships with the professor. (Any Maryland professor will verify this fact.) Undergraduate students are traditionally self-conscious about making a move

that might be interpreted by their fellows as a bid for the teacher's attention. These students were neighborly. One student said, one night after class, "Professor, we thought you might enjoy visiting the Intelligence School and having luncheon with the men." When I agreed, we made a date, and a sergeant called for me in a jeep. Another volunteered, "I'm in charge of transportation around here; if you need a car on official business let me know." My student from the Palace of Justice later escorted me through the courtroom, the prison, and the hanging chamber, and arranged for me to take color pictures. Another student, planning an official trip to nearby Schweinfurt, invited me to come along, and see the new ball-bearing factories that replaced those that had been bombed out. It turned out to be an experience that I will always cherish. With others I attended an American football game in the vast stadium where Hitler used to harangue the Nazis. All sorts of casual social gatherings were suggested by the members of the class.

We ended the course with a dinner meeting, at which the married men brought their wives and the single men an interesting variety of German dates, most of them speaking English. We met in a German castle built by the Faber family, famous for the manufacture of Faber pencils. We had distinguished guests from the base, a small German orchestra, and refreshments before, during, and after the dinner. We listened to about two hours of speaking, and had an audience decision, with prizes for those who had made the best speeches and for those who had made the most improvement. When the dinner and the speeches were over, we had a dance.

No doubt I have overstated the pleasant features of the term. Two of the students did very poor work, and after conference I had to advise them to cancel their registration. Military duties, principally combat maneuvers, caused students to miss classes, and we needed to devise various expedients so they could make up their missed assignments. For a while we were short on reference works, but later a system of traveling kits was set up, so that a variety of textbooks could be put on reserve in the base library. To attend the three-hour session at Bamberg I would need to leave the hotel at five p.m., meet the class, and hold conferences afterwards. On nights when a cold European fog settled over the roads, I would not get home until long after midnight. The preparation of lectures and other activities that would hold the attention of men and women tired from a long day on duty seemed to require a good deal of care. All in all, however, it was an experience I greatly valued.

VIII

Public speaking as a field of study and teaching is as we know a significant discipline of civilian higher education. When the students are members of the armed forces, speaking plays an especially important part. For example, many students have opportunities to make speeches, conduct briefings, and take part in conferences, in outside situations, while they are taking the course. Accordingly, rhetorical theory can be presented by the teacher and discussed by the students, both realizing that practical applications are immediately at hand. Each day's teaching brings all sorts of ideas about speaking into direct contact with military situations in which the students participate.

As for the Overseas Program itself, I should like to quote from the speech delivered by Dr. Reinhard Herbig, rector

of the University of Heidelberg, who, as a neighbor of Maryland's Heidelberg office several years, has been in a position to observe the Program and reflect upon it. At the commencement ceremony held in 1955, Dr. Herbig said:

> The idea behind the Overseas Program is magnificent and worthy of the greatest admiration. . . . It is a program . . . whose ideal is to combine a general education in the arts with the necessarily more specialized professional training. . . .
>
> This concept of educating the "whole man" is one which I feel to be of the greatest importance . . . for the "whole man" is often conspicuously lacking in one whose attitudes and behavior are limited to his function as a soldier. No matter what his nationality may be, a soldier in a foreign country is not only a warrior and an instrument of authority; in addition he should and must also be a good will ambassador for his people. Only a soldier who sincerely tries to develop the best in himself is capable of accomplishing this vital mission.

Generalizing about a far-flung enterprise like the Overseas Program is admittedly difficult. Many students, however, each of whom had studied under instructors ranging all the way from the average and mediocre to the gifted and talented, have described the Overseas Program as one of their most highly-prized experiences. When at times officers at the various bases have thought that the Program presented too many problems, higher ranking officers, of wider vision, have rallied strongly to its support. The eloquent tribute by Dr. Herbig is noteworthy not only because it comes from a scholar of a country formerly our enemy, but also because it views these students and these teachers as people who are making a substantial contribution to international good will.

SOMETHING WEIGHTY TO SAY

> Can it be doubtful that this is still the rule of human education; that the human creature needs first of all to be educated not that he may speak, but that he may have something weighty and valuable to say! If speech is the banknote for an inward capital of culture, of insight and noble human worth, then speech is precious, and the art of speech shall be honored. But if there *is* no inward capital; if speech represent no real culture of the mind, but an imaginary culture; no bullion, but the fatal and now almost hopeless deficit of such? Alas, alas, said banknote is then a *forged* one; passing freely current in the market; but bringing damages to the receiver, to the payer, and to all the world, which are in sad truth infallible, and of amount incalculable. Few think of it at present; but the truth remains forever so. In parliaments and other loud assemblages, your eloquent talk, *dis*-united from Nature and her facts, is taken as wisdom and the correct image of said facts: but Nature well knows what it is, Nature will not have it as such, and will reject your forged note one day, with huge costs. The foolish traders in the market pass it freely, nothing doubting, and rejoice in the dextrous execution of the piece: and so it circulates from hand to hand, and from class to class; gravitating ever downwards towards the *practical* class; till at last it reaches some poor *working* hand, who can pass it no farther, but must take it to the bank to get bread with it, and there the answer is, "Unhappy caitiff, this note is forged. It does not mean performance and reality, in parliaments and elsewhere, for thy behoof; it means fallacious semblance of performance, and thou, poor dupe, art thrown into the stocks on offering it here!"
>
> Thomas Carlyle, "Stump-Orator," in A. M. Drummond and E. L. Hunt, *Persistent Questions in Public Discussion* (New York & London, 1924), p. 435.

INTERPRETATIVE READING AS SYMBOLIC ACTION

David W. Thompson

I

TRADITIONALLY, we think of the meaning or action of an interpretative reading as proceeding from the literary selection to the reader and then to his audience. This describes what happens in terms of the reader's preparation and delivery. But if we think of the process in a wider social context, in terms of the audience first, what happens in an interpretative reading has exactly the reverse pattern: the audience responds to the reader's response to the story, poem, or play. This distinction may seem insignificant and a mere playing with opposites, but it can be of use in the teaching and practice of interpretative reading. Its value lies not, as might appear, in shifting emphasis from the poem to the audience but in the opposite effect: in featuring the unique experience of the literary work as the center or goal of the entire social act of interpretative reading. This article will pursue the same goal, working from the social to the literary aspects of interpretation.

Preparing to read a story, poem, or play to an audience and actually reading it to them are, for most people, two radically different things. Interpretative readers usually have the best intentions in the world of being true to the reality of the literature discovered during their preparation. Unfortunately, they are confronted with an entirely different reality when they step before their audience. The imagined reality of the story has a way of evaporating from them in the face of the immediate reality of the audience. Yet often, after they have read long enough to forget the audience—sometimes at the very end of their reading—they come alive to the story or poem in a way that suggests they once had a vital response to it.

A common attempt at a solution to this problem is to take each reader aside and recommend that he develop confidence in himself as a reader, which is about the same as saying to him, "Try lifting yourself by your psychic bootstraps." The only real and permanent solution, of course, is for the reader to develop confidence in the power and value of imaginative literature; but to accomplish that takes years of living with literature, years of wide and sensitive reading. While the student is getting under way with that long-range solution, there is a temporary and hypothetical one he usually finds interesting and useful to try.

He can try finding some way to "conventionalize" both the audience and the role of reader for the reader himself. He is usually aware that the words he is reading are only *symbols,* conventional and visible signs for the invisible experience of the story, poem, or play. But he usually has no awareness that his own behavior before the audience and the behavior of the audience itself may also be thought of as symbols, conventional and visible signs for *their* invisible experience of the

David W. Thompson (Ph.D., Cornell University, 1947) is Professor of Spee h and Theatre Arts at the University of Minnesota.

story, poem, or play. He can try seeing the entire process of interpretative reading, and not merely the language of literature, as "symbolic action."[1]

He can try seeing the process, at first, as one in which the conventional curiosity of the audience starts attending to the conventional carefulness of the reader as he starts to speak out the conventional arrangement of the literary work. If he sees this opening moment of his reading as just such an organization of automatic, routine conventions—the mere frame around the picture—then, as he reads, he will be free to respond actively to the imagined reality—to let the symbolic language evoke in him the invisible experience it stands for, which, in turn, as it is made manifest in him, will evoke a comparable experience in the audience. In effect, he will be seeing the interpretative reading process as a game or, more accurately, as a play. The cast consists of the audience, the reader, and the literary selection. All three are conventional and made-up elements in the drama of interpretation. From their dramatic interaction, however, can emerge a new entity, a total imaginative action which is intensely meaningful and moving. Interpretative reading is a conventional ceremony dedicated to invigorating mere ceremony with insight.

II

This section offers more specific suggestions as to ways of seeing each of the three parts of the process of interpretation as symbolic action. In order to stress their characteristics as dramatic elements, the audience, the reader, and the literary work are discussed as the *rite,* the *role,* and the *gesture* of interpretative reading. There is no magical significance intended in those three terms. They are chosen simply because they clearly and boldly point to three basic, distinct, and yet closely related kinds of symbolic action.

First, it is useful for the interpretative reader to view the audience as a group participating in something like a *rite* or ceremony. The audience is not likely to be conscious of any ritual aspects in their behavior—nor need they be made conscious of them—but merely their seating themselves in orderly fashion, their looking expectantly toward the reader when he steps before them, their quieting in order to hear him, all indicate their willingness to participate in the "ceremony of listening."[2] Even in this age of "communication," the audience at an interpretative reading may, all unconsciously, be taking the view described by Allen Tate: "Communication that is not also communion is incomplete. We *use* communication; we *participate* in communion."[3]

The student of interpretation who explores the fascinating nature and history of ritual needs no more apology for doing so than Jane Harrison offers: "Ritual, then, has not been studied for its own sake, still less for its connection with any particular dogma. . . . It has been studied because ritual is, we believe, a frequent and perhaps universal

[1] The phrase is from Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1941); but this present approach to interpretative reading was first provoked by the complementary influences of two great teachers of interpretation: Professor Frank M. Rarig with his stress on "action" and Professor A. M. Drummond with his stress on "style." Action plus style equals symbolic action.

[2] This is a reference to the analogous or perhaps identical "ceremony of innocence" which W. B. Yeats, in "The Second Coming," says "is drowned" today, when "The best lack all conviction, while the worst/Are full of passionate intensity."

[3] *The Man of Letters in the Modern World* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955), p. 16.

transition stage between actual life and that peculiar contemplation of or emotion towards life which we call art."[4] Between the audience's practical life and their participation in the literary work lie the ritual aspects of interpretative reading. They may be a bridge or a barrier, depending upon the reader's recognition of their usefulness.

If the reader, and through him the audience, do not at least intuitively recognize the way in which the rite of the reading occasion serves as a bridge to the imagined life in the literary work, the establishment of the necessary psychical distance will be difficult or impossible. These conventions of interpretative reading are no more important than other aesthetic and social conventions—for example, those which prevail in the give-and-take ceremony of conversation. They are only the bridge to the human relationships which lie beyond mere convention. They are of no importance whatever in themselves, except when they are completely absent, whereupon their absence becomes so important it disrupts the entire social and imaginative act of communion.

Secondly, it is useful for the interpretative reader to see himself in the *role* of interpreter. He is the leader of the rite the audience is participating in; and he is qualified to lead—he has special, advance knowledge as to what responses will be appropriate in the rite. The role is that of initiator, in two senses of the word. He initiates, or begins, the empathic responses to the literary work. He initiates, or inducts, the audience into the society of sharers in the total imaginative experience. He leads them in responding to the work, and he leads them to a membership in it.

[4] *Ancient Art and Ritual* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1913), p. 205.

This role of interpreter, of course, includes all the imagined roles in the literary work: the different characters, the narrator if there is one, and most important of all, the author. None of these roles is played by the interpreter in the way in which an actor on a stage would play it. The difference between giving an interpretative reading and acting in a play—a constant source of confusion for students—can be clarified somewhat by seeing the interpreter not in the role of actor but in a role more analogous to that of stage director. The director of a play can more or less "play all the parts." He often does some of this in guiding his actors or in filling in when an actor is absent from a rehearsal. But he never thinks of himself as being cast in any of the actors' roles. He is constantly concerned with broader and more important things than any individual actor can be responsible for: the relationships between the different actors-as-characters and the relationship of all of them to the subtleties and total intention of the text.

The conductor of a musical group does much the same thing in rehearsals and, in one respect, represents an even closer analogy to the interpretative reader—he is visibly there taking charge during the performance. The interpreter, obviously, has no cast of actors to direct nor group of musicians to conduct, nor should he strain to pretend that he has. He does, however, have his own speech behavior to direct and his own imagination plus the imaginations of his audience to conduct through the literary work. His role of interpreter, seemingly so neutral and formal a thing, can contain within it tremendous imaginative suggestion, excitement, and power.

Inexperienced readers sometimes have difficulty developing their powers with-

the reading situation. It is in the sensitive role of interpreter that the contradictions between the rite of the audience and the gesture of the literature are united in an exciting and meaningful pattern of tensions.

The reader faces in both directions at once, toward the literature as the source of his inner gestures and toward the audience whose imaginations these gestures can reach out to and capture. He can and does work from gesture to role to rite as a public communicator, but he does not take this "public service" aspect of his role very seriously. He is more concerned with working from rite to role to gesture as an explorer tracing back our overt behavior to its hidden springs which lie within the gesture of imaginative literature. He apparently communicates the story or poem out to us, but actually he leads us to a communion in it. The rite of the audience and even the role of interpreter are relatively gross and transitory things, but the gesture of imaginative literature is a subtle and permanent source of insight.

III

Although the preceding sections of this article may seem more concerned with symbolic action in life than in literature, that is not the emphasis which is most successful in teaching interpretative reading. Such an emphasis is often only embarrassing—we lack the necessary psychical distance from our rites, roles, and gestures in daily life to scrutinize them publicly without feeling pained. Besides, the role of teacher of interpretative reading is not the same as that of psychoanalyst. Furthermore, the application of rite-role-gesture to the interpretative speech process, once it is explained to students, is readily grasped and put to use. As they gain experience in reading to the group, students almost automatically come to see the audience, themselves, and their voices in a less personal, more conventional way—as parts of a total symbolic action. They are then free to focus their attention upon what should be the main concern of any course in interpretative reading: active exploration of the literature being read.

In this exploration the concept of rite-role-gesture is again of use, this time as a method or framework for analysis of stories, poems, and plays. This, of course, is only another method for such literary analysis; but since its three aspects can be understood only as actions and in terms of interaction between all three, its use in analysis has a way of bringing alive the story, poem, or play even for students inexperienced with imaginative literature. It seems to insist upon, and help fulfill, the prerequisite for interpretation: that the interpreter be actively involved in the literature he proposes to read.

Rites in literature are the most obvious and basic elements—so obvious, in fact, that readers tend to ignore them by not sustaining their implications throughout a reading. They are the different scenes which, taken together, make up the plot. They may be as public as a coronation or as private as a soliloquy. There may be a scene within a scene as, for example, a flashback or a "play within a play." Such elements as setting, time, the characters involved, and their major action are important in determining the nature of a rite. Here, as everywhere in literature, contrast is the key to meaning. There are contrasts between the elements and parts of any one rite and between the expected and actual form of the scene as a whole. There are contrasts and parallels between adjacent and even widely separated scenes in the same work. Rites in imaginative literature are seldom what

they seem to be on the surface. In any well-written piece of literature each scene contributes to the total meaning of the work, although the characters involved are seldom aware of that larger meaning. The interpreter should guard against accepting uncritically a character's limited vision of a rite or scene and, instead, should try to match the author's total view of his scenic structure.

Roles in literature are the patterns of action which are maintained by individual characters long enough to be recognized as significant patterns. Often they are named within the literary work itself. Such factors as professions (soldier, lawyer, teacher), family relationships (son, mother, uncle), and major attitudes (coward, hero, lover) furnish names for common patterns or roles. Most central characters play many different roles, often several at the same time. One of the most common sources of conflict in literature is the struggle within a character between his different roles. What a role amounts to or how it is to be taken by the reader depends upon a composite view of it: the character's own view of himself, the way the other characters see him, and the author's total view. The latter, of course, is the all-important controlling factor, revealed in any number of subtle ways, such as the verve with which the character plays a role, the order in which his roles are assumed, and even the number and range of roles he plays. Certainly Hamlet's astonishing range and brilliance of role-playing reveal much about Shakespeare's attitude toward him.

Gestures in literature are all the words in a novel, poem, or play. The author, of course, is actually making all these gestures in his role of observer or whatever additional attitude he may hold within his actual rite of storytelling, rhapsodizing, or dramatizing. Within the imagined rites of the story, poem, or play, however, all these verbal gestures are being made by imagined characters within their numerous roles.

Students readily see speeches in dialogue form as characters' gestures, but they usually have great difficulty seeing non-dialogue description and narration as gestures made within the active role of narrator, until they grasp the notion of language as gesture. Furthermore, although it is easy to read dialogue so that it sounds lively and superficially in character, it is difficult to read it in terms of the total context in which it occurs: the relationships between a character's speeches and his changing roles, between the speeches of one character and another, and between all the dialogue in a scene and the nature of the rite itself. Without sustained focusing upon such relationships, the reader cannot make the multitude of verbal gestures add up to a total symbolic action. It is a help in this direction to assume that the author invented, selected, and arranged all the gestures in his work—the combinations of words—in terms of a controlling point of view, which is implicit in the nature and total arrangement of the gestures themselves.

To conclude with a discussion of the rite-role-gesture relationships in a novel, story, play, or long poem would take much more space than the present article affords. As an illustration of the method, however, here is an analysis of a brief poem by Emily Dickinson. First, the poem:

> Go not too near a house of rose,
> The depredation of a breeze
> Or inundation of a dew
> Alarm its walls away;
> Nor try to tie the butterfly;
> Nor climb the bars of ecstacy.
> In insecurity to lie
> Is joy's insuring quality.

In this poem and in many lyrics, as distinct from narrative and dramatic poems, rite is not emphasized. In a sense this means it is unimportant, and yet the reader needs to have at least a general picture of the rite—say, "two friends conversing" or, perhaps needlessly specific, "two friends conversing in a sunlit garden." He needs to imagine some such scene so he can begin tracking the poem instead of staying back in the classroom or performing some equally extraneous rite.

Again, as in many lyrics, roles in this poem are not emphasized. Individual actors and the roles they pass through are not of major concern here the way they are in many novels and most plays. And yet the reader at least has to recognize that there are two very different people involved in the action of the poem: the listener in the role of extremist and the speaker in the role of ironic adviser. With rite and role so little stressed, the gestures of the poem, its nuances of language and patterns of imagery, inevitably receive the greatest emphasis, as happens in most lyric poetry.

The broadest action pattern in the gestures of this poem appears to be the abrupt shift from rejection in the first six lines to acceptance in the last two. Looking more closely, one sees that this abrupt shift truly is the major pattern because it is mirrored throughout the poem. The entire action, in all of its details, is attempting to maintain an insecure yet satisfying equilibrium between the contradictory gestures of rejecting and accepting.

The first three lines have a shocking and humorous incongruity of gesture between their alarmist openings and their delicate endings—between "Go not," "depredation," "inundation" and "rose," "breeze," "dew." They are comparable in their action pattern to that of a playful child who rushes ferociously to a kitten and pats it tenderly. The fourth line suddenly gives way entirely to sounding the alarm. The fifth seems to be doing the same thing even more strenuously because of its pounding emphasis on "try," "tie," "fly"; but the sudden recognition that it was a fragile *butterfly* leaves one insecure and empty-handed. The sixth line, in terms of the poem as a whole, begins with the most strenuous gesture of rejection trying to escape itself and ends with the most surprising gesture of total acceptance of one's self, of "ecstacy." And the last two lines, apparently an abstract statement of the "idea" of the poem instead of an action, are really a gesture of pointing the way. The direction in which to go is indicated by the three insistent repetitions of "in," pointing to that region within, below, or beyond gesture where "insecurity" and "joy" lie wedded.[7]

What the poem "says"—and its total pattern of contrasting actions is much more complicated than these few suggestions have indicated—is acted out in the gestures of its language. Delivering a complete analysis of those gestures—if such is ever possible with imaginative literature—would take considerable time and many words that are not in the poem, while a responsive oral reading of the poem would demonstrate its total structure or meaning in the less than one minute it takes to read it and would do so in terms of the language, the gestures, of the poem itself.

IV

This article began by talking about interpretative reading as a "process"

[7] Cf. Keats's "Ode on Melancholy," especially the lines: "Ay, in the very temple of Delight/Veiled Melancholy has her sovran shrine,/ Though seen of none save him whose strenuous tongue/Can burst Joy's grape against his palate fine."

and a "social act." It has attempted to show how that basic process or action may be transformed into a "symbolic action," one possessing more intense and manifold meanings than casual, practical action has—unless it, too, comes to be seen as symbolic. Central in that attempt was the application of the "dramatistic" concept of rite-role-gesture to the audience-reader-literature process of interpretation. Finally, the same concept was shown to be applicable as a method for analysis of stories, poems, and plays the interpreter plans to read. It has, in fact, been derived mainly from such literature, the source and the goal of interpretative reading.

Imaginative literature, an art, is always symbolic action. Interpretative reading becomes an art when it, too, becomes symbolic action. It then shares the purpose common to all the arts: to afford us a realm of experience in which the actions of practical life are held back and sublimated so that we are temporarily free to recognize and contemplate their meanings as revealed in the form of symbolic action.

READING NATURALLY

To read naturally is a common and a very vague phrase. The question is, what *is* nature? It is the object of the science and art of reading, to realize as fully as possible the imperfectly realized instincts of the voice. "There is a power in science which searches, discovers, amplifies, and completes, and which all the strength of spontaneous effort can never reach."

When people speak of the natural in expression, they generally mean nature on the plane on which they are best acquainted with it—the plane of common speech. But the language of the higher poetry, or of tragedy, or even of impassioned prose, is, more or less, an idealized language, for the expression of which a corresponding idealization of voice is demanded. To read, for example, Milton's apostrophe to Light, at the beginning of the third book of Paradise Lost, after the manner of common speech, would be somewhat absurd. The idealization of voice demanded for the reading of such language, is not, however, a departure from nature, but is nature on a higher plane.

"Enter into the *spirit* of what you read, read *naturally*, and you will read well," is about the sum and substance of what Archbishop Whateley teaches on the subject, in his "Elements of Rhetoric." Similar advice might with equal propriety be given to a clumsy, stiff-jointed clodhopper in regard to dancing: "Enter into the spirit of the dance, dance naturally, and you will dance well." The more he might enter into the spirit of the dance, the more he might emphasize his stiff-jointedness and his clodhopperishness.

Of this distinguished advocate of "natural" reading and speaking, Mr. Grant, writing in 1835, says: "Oratory is not his forte, . . . he goes through his addresses in so clumsy and inanimate a way that noble lords at once come to the conclusion that nothing so befits him as unbroken silence. He speaks in so low a tone as to be inaudible to those who are any distance from him. And not only is his voice low in its tones, but it is unpleasant from its monotony. In his manner there is not a particle of life or spirit. You would fancy his grace to be half asleep while speaking. You see so little appearance of consciousness about him that you can hardly help doubting whether his legs will support him until he has finished his address."

Hiram Corson, *The Voice and Spiritual Education* (New York, 1923), pp. 13-16.

ASPECTS OF MODERN RHETORIC IN FRANCIS BACON

Karl R. Wallace

I

IF readers know a certain book, *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric,* let me say immediately that I do not intend to rehash that volume, to present it again in part, or to reduce it to epitome. To do any of these things, Bacon himself would say, would be to paddle about in the shoals and shallows of knowledge. Rather, I shall attempt something else. I shall assume that you are concerned, in some way or other, with the chief problems of modern communication, with public address and rhetoric, and with their manifestations in our society. I should hope, therefore, to stir your main streams of interest and to mix with them some of the streams of Bacon's thought. Some of the currents of the early seventeenth century run well with the currents of today. Accordingly, I am suggesting that Bacon's interests in the nature and processes of oral communication coincide with the interests of modern students of communication. His dominant interests are their dominant interests. With a little adjustment in vocabulary, he would be able to talk directly to them, and they could converse with him.

II

Among students who are primarily interested in the arts of written and spoken discourse and in the phenomena of language behavior, we have in recent years witnessed a common drive towards understanding the nature of the communication process. If one looks broadly at the work of these students, one can discern at least two points of focus. First, they try to get at the facts of communication in the manner of a scientist: they try to maintain a scientific attitude and to use scientific methods of analysis. They look at language behavior as a series of discrete physical events. They speak of bits of information, and they dissect the patterns and forms of spoken language. They welcome the knowledge and co-operation of the electronic engineer, the mathematician, the descriptive linguist, and phonetician. Second, apart from the events of communication, students today are concerned with the psychology of the listener and the speaker—with what affects the listener, and with what goes on in the head of the speaker, and why. They want to improve the art of communication. They are concerned with the speaker's meaning and the listener's interpretation of it. They want to make the use of language more accurate and more efficient. They wish to guard against ambiguities and errors of interpretation, and prevent sophistical usage. In their endeavors they welcome the aid and co-operation of the logician, the semanticist, the psychologists who specialize in perception and group behavior. With both of these points of focus Bacon has much in common.

Bacon's attitude towards knowledge

Karl R. Wallace (Ph.D., Cornell University, 1933) is Professor of Speech and Head of the Department at the University of Illinois. He was President of the SAA in 1954. *This paper was originally presented as part of a lecture at the Ohio State University and at the Universities of Missouri, Oregon, and Washington, in the spring and fall, 1955.*

and its advancement is nothing if it is not scientific. He is passionately committed to observation and experiment. He attempted to develop a method of controlled observation which would reliably reveal the secrets of natural phenomena. In *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon,* published in 1948, Professor Fulton Anderson underlines Bacon's consuming passion. The Lord Chancellor may never have formulated his new method of scientific investigation completely and clearly, but he did enough with it to show us its spirit.

In undertaking scientific study, an observer must first consider a *particular* thing or event. Bacon directs the observer to note its quantity and its qualities, aided by such instruments as are available. When any change in the event is evident, the observer records what went before and what afterward, what is present and what is absent in similar events. The observer's object is always a search for material and efficient causes; he must guard against reading into the event any intention or purpose. The observer will next record his observations in tables of presence and absence of the behavior at hand. Only after noting all possible cases will he permit himself to frame a generalization and thus take the first step up the ladder from experience. At this point, however, Bacon warns the "experimenter" that he must not yet ascend farther up the ladder. He must step down again and test his general idea by looking once more to the relevant particulars. At this juncture, moreover, he should determine whether contrary events yield a contrary conclusion. When the observer is finally satisfied that he can frame a reliable generalization, he must record it in language that is explicit, clear, and denotative, freeing it of ambiguity and of connotative colorations. The expression thus achieved Bacon always refers to as *aphoristic.* Phrased as an aphorism, the conclusion is in shape for other readers and scientists to test and to build upon.

This is the method Bacon called the New Induction. I have presented it incompletely, but I think I have accurately indicated its essence and at the same time the attitude of the man behind it. The new method, systematically employed by a multitude of investigators, was to lead to a new interpretation of nature, a properly grounded natural philosophy, which would enable men to control natural forces to their benefit.

In his lifetime Bacon supplied some examples, all of them incomplete, of his method at work. These, together with his attack on the traditional deductive method and on the sterility of university education, profoundly influenced the scientific movement in the seventeenth century. Bacon is commonly known as the Father of the Royal Society. Professor Anderson, in examining materials for a history of philosophy in the last half of the seventeenth century, reviewed the works of some two hundred authors. He discovered that "no name is mentioned and no writings are quoted more often than those of Bacon."[1] He states further:

> Shortly after the middle of the century the "Advancement of Learning" became a major crusade. "Experimental Philosophy," with varying interpretations . . . was accepted by a legion as the only "real" and "solid" learning. Bacon was greeted as the "secretary of nature," hailed as the "modern Aristotle," and praised as the "restorer of physics" and, therefore, as the "architect" of future philosophy.[2]

Although the scientific method, as we know it, has paid off most handsomely

[1] Fulton H. Anderson, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 293.

in the natural sciences, it is hopefully—sometimes fruitfully—employed in the social sciences. Accordingly, experimenters in rhetorical processes may claim Bacon's sanction, if they wish. The *Novum Organum* (1620), almost Bacon's last word on the new induction, declares that the new instrument may be applied to all fields of investigation:

> It may also be asked . . . whether I speak of natural philosophy only, or whether I mean that the other sciences, logic, ethics, and politics, should be carried on by this method. Now I certainly mean what I have said to be understood of all; and as the common logic, which governs by syllogism, extends not only to natural but to all sciences; so does mine also, which proceeds by induction, embrace everything.[3]

In Bacon's classification of knowledge, communication and rhetoric fall under human philosophy, a branch of natural philosophy. Hence, Bacon seems to expect that the rhetorician will use the new method to advance knowledge about public address.

Bacon, then, is as thoroughgoing a scientist in method and in attitude as his times would let him be. Indeed, he seems to be an Elizabethan materialist. He will not allow science to become mixed up and distracted by speculations over the final end, purpose, or goal of natural phenomena; he rules out all teleological fancies. Moreover, he draws a sharp line between natural science and theology. Furthermore, he maintains the same position, the same point of view, when he treats of the science of human behavior, the "doctrine of Man."

III

When Bacon turns to consider man as a creature who thinks and communicates, he operates like a psychologist, a philologist, a semanticist, and a rhetorician. He combines them all, and we are not allowed to forget the intimate and abiding kinship among them. The kinship is most evident in his works when he treats of the four intellectual arts. These he links with the rational aspect of man's mind. The four arts are divided "according to the ends whereunto they are referred: for man's labour is to *invent* that which is *sought* or *propounded;* or to *judge* that which is *invented;* or to *retain* that which is *judged;* or to *deliver over* that which is *retained*."[4] Accordingly, the rational arts focus upon inquiry or invention, critical examination or judgment, retention or memory, and transmission or communication. These activities engage the faculties of understanding, reason, memory, and imagination. The faculties are separate entities; yet they all come into play when man discovers and creates, when he interprets and judges, and when he communicates.

When Bacon deals with invention or discovery, he confronts questions like these: What takes place in the act of discovery? What conditions will stimulate and encourage discovery? The problems implicit in these questions probably held greater fascination for Bacon than any others, for his chief object, as a man of learning, was to develop a new method of "induction" which would discover the hidden secrets of nature.

Probing into the nature of discovery, Bacon declares that it is "of two kinds, very different. . . ."[5] One kind of inventive activity uncovers or "discloses" the sort of information and data which eventually are built up into the organized knowledge of the arts and sciences. This kind of discovery, directed to all

[3] *Novum Organum*, in *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, R. L. Ellis, and D. D. Heath (London, 1879), IV, 112. Cited below as *Works*.

[4] *Advancement of Learning* in *Works*, III, 383-384.

[5] *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, IV, 2; *Works*, IV, 407.

natural and physical phenomena, brings forth the truly *new*—what we know we have not known before about Nature. The data we seek are not only beyond our experience; they are data we do not recall or recognize as having experienced before. Possibly Bacon is meaning to say that new knowledge is that aspect of reality to which we attach a symbol for the first time. By symbolizing, indeed, we bring the object within our experience.

Once the object is symbolized, we are always capable of using it again; we are creatures of *recall*. And when we recognize that we are repeating an experience, we may say that it is "old."

If I have correctly interpreted that kind of inventive activity which is "new," we have set the stage for Bacon's second kind of invention. It is the invention "of speech and arguments." In strict usage, Bacon indicates, "the invention of arguments is not properly an invention; for to invent is to discover that we know not, not to recover or resummon that which we already know." Furthermore, "the use and office of this invention is no other than out of the mass of knowledge which is collected and laid up in the mind to draw forth readily that which may be pertinent to the matter or question which is under consideration."[6] This kind of discovery, Bacon writes in a flash of insight, is "but a remembrance or suggestion with an application."[7] In studying and in seeking to improve his inventive powers, a communicator is primarily motivated by "readiness and present use of . . . knowledge, rather than addition or amplification thereof."[8]

In considering the rest of the intellectual arts, Bacon for the most part deals with man's symbols—their nature, and his management of them. The art of judgment or criticism embraces all those mental operations by which one evaluates the results of invention. It is the art which "handles the nature of proofs and demonstrations."[9] Here Bacon is clearly using *proof* in the older sense of *test*. In science, whose instrument of discovery is the new induction, Bacon shrewdly remarks that "the same action of the mind which discovers the thing in question judges it. . . ."[10]

In the humanities—and in all subjects as traditionally studied—evaluation has always been managed through the syllogism. This instrument of reason, Bacon observes, requires two distinct movements of the mind. The syllogism is "but the reduction of propositions to principles in a middle term. . . ."[11] Finding the middle term and stating the specific premise of an argument are a kind of invention, for the behavior involves "free exercise of wit and inquiry." After finding an appropriate middle term, the mind comes to rest, as it were, and judges the results of its inquiry. Bacon's own terse reference to the two operations is put thus: "The invention of the mean is one thing, and the judgment of the consequence is another; for the mind ranges first, and rests afterwards."[12]

As he inspects critical thought, Bacon is not much interested in providing positive rules and directions for judgment; rather, he raises warnings and cautions against those traps and errors of perception to which the mind by its own nature is prone. His warnings are classified as fallacies. If we are to judge well, we must learn to detect three varieties: so-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 421.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 422.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 422.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 428.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 428.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 429.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 428.

phistical fallacies, fallacies of interpretation, and false appearances or idols. They serve as "monitors" to reason.

Although we cannot now fully describe Bacon's detective apparatus for the prevention of error, we should observe that in talking about the hazards of interpretation and in particular about the Idols of the Market Place, he speaks like a present-day semanticist. Bacon reminds us that "common and general notions enter necessarily into every discussion; so that unless great care be taken to distinguish them well at the outset, all the light of disputations will be strangely clouded with darkness by them, and the matter end in disputes about words." The Idols of the Market Place "have crept into the understanding through the tacit agreement of men concerning the imposition of words and names."[13] One of our difficulties, Bacon asserts acutely, is that "words are generally framed and applied according to the conception of the vulgar, and draw lines of separation according to such differences as the vulgar can follow: and where a more acute intellect or a more diligent observation tries to introduce a better distinction, words rebel."[14] And when man tries to rid his language of ambiguities and imprecise meanings by recourse to definition, he is often merely trading one evil for another. The trouble with definitions is that they themselves "consist of words, and words beget words. And although we think we govern our words, and it is easy to say 'a man should speak as the vulgar, and think as the wise'; and though technical terms . . . may seem to answer the purpose . . . yet all is not enough, but the juggleries and charms of words will in many ways seduce and forcibly disturb the judgment. . . ."[15]

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 433.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 433.
[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 433-434.

Before leaving the fallacies and idols, we should face an interesting question. Why was Bacon willing to spend so much of his time in accenting the negative rules and conditions of reasoning, rather than the positive rules? The answer, I believe, is taken from Bacon's view of the mind. His view is most concisely stated in the *De Augmentis Scientiarum:* "The faculties of the soul are well known; understanding, reason, imagination, memory, appetite, will; in short all with which the logical and ethical sciences deal."[16] To Bacon the understanding and the reason would always do right by man and the appetite and the will would always serve the intellect obediently, if only they were not beset by difficulties of man's own making. But in fact "the government of reason is assailed and disordered" in three principal ways: by sophistical reasoning, by careless, ambiguous, and inflammatory use of language, and by stirring the passions to violence. Just as there are communication and negotiation among men, there is communication among the faculties. "For as in negotiations with others, men are usually wrought either by cunning, or by importunity or by vehemency; so likewise in this negotiation within ourselves, we are either undermined by fallacies or arguments, or solicited and importuned by assiduity of impressions and observations, or agitated and transported by violence of passions."[17] Left undisturbed, the faculties will serve rational thinking; properly cultivated and taught, the faculties can strengthen and enthrone reason.

. . . the end of logic is to teach a form of argument to secure reason, and not to entrap it; the end likewise of moral philosophy is to procure the affections to fight on the side of reason, and not to invade it; the end of

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 398.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 455.

rhetoric is to fill the imagination with observations and images, to second reason, and not to oppress it.[18]

IV

The last of the intellectual arts, the "Art of Transmission," finds Bacon at work combining psychology, language, and communication. He tells us plainly that the Art of Transmission is a general, inclusive name; it "includes all the arts which relate to words and discourse."[19] In treating of this art, he makes two crucial assumptions. First, language behavior is inseparably connected with mental events. Second, for the sake of study and analysis, language behavior should be regarded as a series of physical events which can be observed independent of their mental counterparts. On these two points, Bacon's key sentence is this: "although reason be as it were the soul of discourse, yet in the handling of them reason and discourse should be kept separate, no less than soul and body."[20] With this idea permeating his treatment of communication, Bacon can write consistently of the medium or vehicle of discourse, as well as of the management of discourse.

Communication is divided into three parts: the organ, body, or vehicle of discourse; the method of discourse; and the illustration of discourse. To the body and organ of communication, Bacon gives the name of grammar. It has two parts: speech and writing. At this point Bacon is again intrigued with the relation of body to mind, for he quotes Aristotle approvingly: "'words are the images of thought and letters are the images of words.'"[21] Bacon recognizes, moreover, that communication employs other kinds of sign and symbol. His remark is profound and sweeping: "Whatever can be divided into differences sufficiently numerous to explain the variety of notions (provided those differences be perceptible to the sense) may be made a vehicle to convey the thoughts of one man to another."[22] With this standard in mind, Bacon suggests a broad classification of signs, a sign being a "note" of a thing. One kind of sign is "where the note has some congruity with the notion."[23] Here he locates a language of gesture. Here also is a language of graphics, which he calls hieroglyphics. "It is plain," he observes, "that Hieroglyphics and Gestures have always some similitude to the thing signified, and are a kind of emblems."[24]

Another kind of sign interests Bacon greatly. It is the kind, *ad placitum*, which through usage is "adopted and agreed upon at pleasure." Within this class of sign, Bacon places what he calls "real characters." The characters "represent neither letters nor words, but things and notions"; they are "merely surds . . . silently agreed upon by custom."[25] Furthermore, "there ought to be as many of them as there are radical words." Bacon's curiosity about real characters was aroused because he thought he had discovered "that a number of nations whose languages are altogether different, but who agree in the use of such characters . . . communicate with each other in writing; to such an extent indeed that any book written in characters of this kind can be read off by each nation in their own language."[26] One cannot confidently say what Bacon means here, but perhaps he is calling for the study of language *roots*—linguistic elements common to a family of lan-

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 455-456.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 439.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 439.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 439.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 439.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 440.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 440.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 440.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 439.

guages, which have acquired common cores of significance despite diversity of vocabulary and structure.

We shall mention but one other feature of the organ or vehicle of discourse. It illustrates Bacon's philological bent. One of the branches of grammar, Bacon writes, "ministers in a certain degree to philosophy."[27] In the first place, he is thinking of the ways in which speech reflects the social and cultural habits of its speakers. The scholar can draw from his study of languages something "concerning the dispositions and manners of peoples and nations. . . ."[28] Accordingly, Bacon says:

> I like well that remark of Cicero's that the Greeks had no word to express the Latin *ineptus;* "because" says he, "that vice was so familiar among the Greeks that they did not perceive it in themselves"; a censure worthy of the Roman gravity. And how came it that the Greeks used such liberty in composition of words, the Romans on the contrary were so strict and sparing in it? One may plainly collect from this fact that the Greeks were fitter for arts, the Romans for business; for the distinctions of arts are hardly expressed without composition of words; whereas for the transaction of business simpler words are wanted.[29]

Bacon's philological interest, in the second place, leads him to call for a comparative study of languages. The study would take in "a great number of tongues, learned as well as vulgar," and would consider the various properties of languages, "showing in what points each excelled, in what it failed."[30] Thus may languages be "enriched by mutual exchanges [and] the several beauties of each may be combined . . . into a most beautiful image and excellent model of speech itself, for the right expressing of the meanings of the mind."[31]

Bacon of course links other studies and disciplines to the medium or vehicle of discourse. He mentions the physiology of speech sounds, the measure or rhythm of speech and poetry, and the accent and intonation of spoken language. But his treatment of these would seem to be less profound and probably less suggestive to the modern mind than the aspects of communication we have already noticed. We must also pass by his observations on the method of discourse, remarking only upon his insistence that the plan, pattern, arrangement, and order of any composition must always be a function of its subject matter and its purpose.

V

Bacon's last category of the art of communication—the part named the illustration of discourse—is specifically identified with rhetoric and oratory. One looks in vain in Bacon's works for a formal definition of rhetoric; nevertheless Bacon speaks plainly in describing the *function* of rhetoric. "The duty and office of Rhetoric, if it be deeply looked into, is no other than to apply and to recommend the dictates of reason to imagination, in order to excite the appetite and will."[32] The statement strikingly demonstrates the marriage of rhetoric with psychology. First, the statement names four of the faculties—reason, imagination, appetite, and will. Second, it designates the kinds of operations which rhetoric (and indeed any art of communication) must employ. It must recognize and make use of the products of reason —the materials and forms of argument. It must take stock of the states of mind of listener and reader—with aspects of behavior which psychology now calls dispositions, attitudes, motives, and

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 441.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 442.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 442.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 441.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 442.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 445.

emotions. It must deal with the problems of selecting and presenting arguments in keeping with its audience. It must present arguments characteristically in the language of imagery.

But Bacon does more than generally describe the function of rhetoric. He justifies his view; and he grounds his explanation in psychological terms. This is his rationale: First, rhetoric is an art of popular communication, rather than an art of scientific communication. It takes men as they are, not as they ought to be.

Second, if reason is to rule in popular affairs, it needs help. Reason alone provides merely a kind of "dry light," having little power by itself, except when addressed to a scientific, critical intellect. The popular mind is too often controlled by affections and passions, which rise up and engulf the reason. But rational behavior prevails when the imagination rushes in, takes the findings of reason, and excites the affections according to the dictates of the intellect. Bacon's own statement of the phenomena is in these words: "If the affections themselves were brought to order, and [were] pliant and obedient to reason, it is true there would be no great use of persuasions and insinuations to give access to the mind, but naked and simple propositions and proofs would be enough. But the affections do on the contrary make such secessions and raise such mutinies and seditions . . . that reason would become captive and servile, if eloquence of persuasions did not win the imagination from the affections' part, and contract a confederacy between the reason and the imagination against them."[33] Between the faculty of reason and the faculties of appetite and will, the imagination is a messenger; it steps in to translate reason into its imageful equivalents.

Third, the confederacy of reason and the affections is made effective, says Bacon, because the affections, when not mutinous, are always oriented towards the good. Reason also faces towards the good. Reason and appetite both look to the good; thus, they reveal a common bond which the imagination exploits. Indeed, "it is the business of rhetoric to make pictures of virtue and goodness, so that they may be seen. For since they cannot be showed to the sense in corporeal shape, the next degree is to show them to the imagination in as lively representation as possible, by ornament of words."[34] This kind of representation suggests that the subject matter of rhetoric is *imaginative reason*.

Finally, the reason and the affections differ principally in this: reason can look to the future, to things possible and probable, whereas the affections are chained to the present. Hence one of the special tasks of rhetoric is to move the future to the present. The affections, so Bacon holds, behold "principally the good which is present; reason looks beyond and beholds likewise the future and the sum of all. And therefore the present filling the imagination more, reason is commonly vanquished and overcome. But after eloquence and force of persuasion have made things future and remote appear as present, then upon the revolt of imagination to reason, reason prevails."[35]

In his views on communication, rhetoric, and the behavior of the rhetorical imagination, Bacon has saturated communication with psychology. Communication must rely upon all the faculties of the mind. It engages the whole man. So far as I know, no modern scholar or

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 456-457.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 456.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 457.

scientist, whether he be psychologist, linguist, or rhetorician, has so explicitly and comprehensively imbued communication with psychology. One is tempted to say that Bacon is not merely modern; he is ultra-modern.

VI

In conclusion, perhaps we may say that although Bacon is over three hundred years behind us he is not far away from us when he talks of the basic problems of communication. If we are not repelled by his vocabulary and his faculties of the mind, he can stiffen the backbone of the modern student who wants to study communication scientifically, who knows that he cannot fully comprehend communication and rhetoric unless he understands their relationships to linguistics and psychology—and to other relevant humanistic and social studies, who wants truly to see the arts of discourse and discussion serve good rather than evil, and who keenly realizes that he must attack directly the sources of ambiguity and sophistry which muddy the springs of meaning and which defeat our attempts to speak accurately and effectively with each other.

EMERSON'S FIRST LECTURES

To be young is surely the best, if the most precarious, gift of life; yet there are some of us who would hardly consent to be young again, if it were at the cost of our recollection of Mr. Emerson's first lectures during the consulate of Van Buren. We used to walk in from the country to the Masonic Temple (I think it was), through the crisp winter night, and listen to that thrilling voice of his, so charged with subtle meaning and subtle music, as shipwrecked men on a raft to the hail of a ship that came with unhoped-for food and rescue. Cynics might say what they liked. Did our own imaginations transfigure dry remainder-biscuit into ambrosia? At any rate, he brought us *life*, which, on the whole, is no bad thing. Was it all transcendentalism? magic-lantern pictures on mist? As you will. Those, then, were just what we wanted. But it was not so. The delight and the benefit were that he put us in communication with a larger style of thought, sharpened our wits with a more pungent phrase, gave us ravishing glimpses of an ideal under the dry husk of our New England; made us conscious of the supreme and everlasting originality of whatever bit of soul might be in any of us; freed us, in short, from the stocks of prose in which we had sat so long that we had grown wellnigh contented in our cramps. And who that saw the audience will ever forget it, where every one still capable of fire, or longing to renew in himself the half-forgotten sense of it, was gathered? Those faces, young and old, agleam with pale intellectual light, eager with pleased attention, flash upon me once more from the deep recesses of the years with an exquisite pathos. Ah, beautiful young eyes, brimming with love and hope, wholly vanished now in that other world we call the Past, or peering doubtfully through the pensive gloaming of memory, your light impoverishes these cheaper days!

James Russell Lowell, "Emerson the Lecturer," in *The Writings of James Russell Lowell* (Boston and New York, 1892), I, 354-355.

THE FORUM

A NEW EDITOR TAKES OVER

Between this issue and the next, the *QJS* passes into the capable hands of Donald C. Bryant and a new editorial board, just as at the same time three years ago it was transferred from Bower Aly and his associates to the present panel of editors.

Changes in editorship of our oldest publication usually bring a sense of relief to the outgoing board and perhaps also to some subscribers and readers. The relief felt by the outgoing board springs from the fact that the editing of the *QJS* is not a Sunday school picnic, not a job that can be done on Sunday afternoons, but an obligation that fills all of the editor's leisure, impinges upon all of his other professional obligations, and ends by threatening to absorb all of his working hours. In fact, it's a hard job, and the provision of the By-Laws of the SAA limiting an editor to a single three-year term is merciful as well as prudential. As for the relief which subscribers and readers may feel at the present change of editorship, the outgoing board has no firm evidence for or against it. An editorial regime within the framework of a professional organization like the SAA never really knows how bad (or how good) it is considered to be. A few letters on each side trickle in, but on the whole *QJS* readers do not indulge in catcalls or applause. Such an absence of response may be accepted by an editor as a favorable sign, on the theory that no news is good news; or it may lead him to wonder whether there is widespread indifference to his editorial practices, and a general lack of interest in the status of the *QJS* as a professional journal. On these scores, however, the present editor has no firm reason to congratulate or accuse himself—he has reason only to express to his professional Association his own sense of having been honored by his election as editor and of having been taught many new and useful lessons in the discharge of that office.

In this final issue of his regime, the editor wishes to thank his editorial associates publicly as he has frequently done in private. They have helped him by soliciting manuscripts, by evaluating contributed articles, by submitting contributions of their own, and by offering advice on the problems that editorship brings up. It is not an empty compliment to say that, if the *QJS* has in fact managed pretty well in the last three years, the credit belongs to the editor's associates. This acknowledgment, of course, is not intended to make the editorial board responsible for any of the weaknesses or shortcomings in the *QJS* during the regime now ending. The present editor has to assume full liability for whatever mistakes may have been made in his term, and his liability will not be decreased when he emphasizes that he has on occasion overruled members of his board and published or rejected articles against their consent. During the past three years, the associate editors have been listed on the inside front cover of each issue. Now, at the end of their terms, they should also be listed here by name, special field, and university affiliation, that they may receive the thanks of all readers of this department:

Carroll C. Arnold, Discussion, Cornell University

Donald C. Bryant, British Public Address, Washington University, St. Louis

Robert D. Clark, American Public Address, University of Oregon

Leland M. Griffin, New Books in Review, Northwestern University

Frederick W. Haberman, Rhetoric, University of Wisconsin

Lee S. Hultzén, Phonetics, University of Illinois

Wendell Johnson, Speech Pathology, State University of Iowa

Norman W. Mattis, Forensics, University of North Carolina

Loren Reid, Shop Talk, University of Missouri

John J. Rudin II, Homiletics, Duke University

Ross Scanlan, Propaganda and Public Opinion, College of the City of New York

Joseph F. Smith, Interpretation, University of Hawaii

E. J. West, Drama, University of Colorado

Jane Dorsey Zimmerman, Teaching of Speech, Teachers College, Columbia University

Two members of the original board are missing from this list, but not from the acknowledgments and thanks that are intended here. One of them, Irving J. Lee, died on May 23, 1955, and thus was lost to the *QJS* and to our profession. The other, Giraud Chester, resigned from the board in January, 1956, in order to devote his entire time to his work as General Programming Executive of the Television Network of NBC, although his resignation was not made effective until the following April. The *QJS* and our profession as a whole wish him well in his new position, and express regret that he is no longer a worker in our corner of the vineyard.

In addition to the associate editors, four or five other individuals deserve the thanks of the present editor and the SAA as a whole. Mr. Arthur E. Fox, Assistant to the President of Princeton University, was helpful in securing office space and office furnishings for the *QJS* during her stay on the Princeton campus. Professor Carlos Baker, Chairman of the English Department at Princeton, not only was instrumental in making certain English Department funds available to the *QJS* for use in securing editorial assistance, but he also gave the editor certain allowances of time on his teaching schedule for the discharge of editorial duties. Mr. Nelson Heath Meriwether, printer of the *QJS*, has been helpful in more ways than the editor can acknowledge—in the editorial field as well as in the field of printing. Finally, the present editor has been singularly fortunate in having during his entire term an expert proofreader in Mrs. Jeremiah S. Finch and an expert editorial secretary in Mrs. John A. Winterbottom, both of Princeton. Mrs. Finch has read proof for each issue of the *QJS* in the past three years, and has prevented many errors that escaped the eyes of the editor and the authors. Mrs. Winterbottom has not only served as one of the proofreaders of the *QJS* but also has helped the editor in preparing copy for the printer, in answering correspondence, and in keeping the editorial office in efficient working order.

In this final issue the present editor also wishes to extend to his successor, Donald C. Bryant, warm congratulations and best wishes, and to say publicly what everyone feels privately that the *QJS* will have the best of care during the next three years. To all members of

the SAA who have manuscripts or book reviews or news items to contribute to the *QJS*, the present editor suggests that they address themselves either to Bryant's editorial office, 105 Brookings Hall, Washington University, Saint Louis 5, Missouri, or to one of the following of Bryant's Contributing or Consulting Editors:

Contributing Editors

Book Reviews: Robert Gunderson, Oberlin College
Shop Talk: Richard Murphy, University of Illinois
The President's Page: Loren Reid, University of Missouri

Consulting Editors

Rhetoric and Criticism: Marie Hochmuth, University of Illinois
British Public Address: Carroll Arnold, Cornell University
American Public Address: Leland Griffin, Northwestern University
Speech and Hearing: John V. Irwin, University of Wisconsin
Drama and Theatre: Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State University
Public Speaking and Forensics: Douglas Ehninger, University of Florida
Communication Skills: Carl Dallinger, State University of Iowa
Business and Professional Speaking: David Potter, Michigan State University
Adult Education: Earnest Brandenburg, Washington University, St. Louis
Interpretation: Wallace A. Bacon, Northwestern University
Phonetics: C. K. Thomas, Cornell University
TV and Radio: Warren Guthrie, Western Reserve University
Teaching of Speech: Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University
Homiletics and Preaching: Robert D. Clark, University of Oregon

W. S. H.

SOURCE MATERIALS IN THE FIELD OF THEATRE

To the Editor:

About four years ago, upon completion of its microfilm project, *British and Continental Rhetoric and Elocution,* the Speech Association of America appointed a Committee on Microfilming Source Materials in the Field of Theatre. The committee's purpose was to compile a list of important documents and books on drama and the theatre that are difficult, sometimes impossible, of access to the scholar.

The original committee, under the chairmanship of Professor George R. Kernodle, now of the University of Arkansas, spent a year or more compiling a list which it then sent to some thirty colleagues and librarians throughout the country for comment, additions, and deletions. With this information at hand, a subsequent committee revised the list, enlarging it to almost ninety titles, arranged it according to subject matter, and then set about the task of locating the volumes for microfilming.

The major part of the material—some 48,000 pages in all—is in French, German, and Italian; approximately one-quarter is in English. Although very few of the foreign titles are available in English, some use will be made of translated portions of books to be found in American theses and dissertations. University Microfilms plans to make the reels available to libraries by subscription at about $240.

Among the valuable works which will soon be easily accessible on microfilm

might be mentioned Pier Maria Cecchini's *Discorsi intorno alle commedie..*; Du Fresnel's *Essai sur la perfection du jeu theatral..;* d'Hannetaire's *Observations sur l'art du comedien;* Francois and Claude Parfaict's *Histoire de l'ancien theatre Italien*; Iffland's *Theorie der Schauspielkunst*; Maudit-Larive's *Reflexions sur l'art du comedien;* Giulio Ferrario's *Storia e descrizione dei principali teatri, antichi e moderne;* and Adolphe Appia's *Die Musik und die Inscenierung.*

Of particular interest to students of the English-speaking theatre will be the complete microfilm of Gordon Craig's magnificent periodical *The Mask* and most, if not all, of *The New York Dramatic Mirror,* the most important American theatrical journal of the period 1879-1922.

Only the first volume of William Davenport Adams' *Dictionary of the Drama* was published (1904), covering the letters A-G. The microfilm will contain material from the projected second volume. Also, there will be microfilmed the manuscript dramatic diary of Laurence Hutton in eight volumes, an extant work, like the Adams, unknown save to a few theatre scholars.

Except for a few fugitive pieces, the drama criticism of Edward A. Dithmar influential critic of the *New York Times,* is unavailable in printed form. The microfilm will contain 2,100 pages of his work, an extraordinary panorama of the New York theatre from 1884 to 1901.

The committee which completed the project during the past two years was composed of William W. Melnitz, UCLA; George R. Kernodle, University of Arkansas; Frederick W. Haberman, University of Wisconsin; Hubert C. Heffner and Richard Moody, University of Indiana; and Robert Dierlam, Queens College. The present writer served as chairman. Others to whom the committee is indebted include Barnard Hewitt and Karl Wallace, University of Illinois; Henry Schnitzler, UCLA; William G. B. Carson, Washington University, St. Louis; Jonathan W. Curvin and Ronald E. Mitchell, University of Wisconsin.

ALBERT E. JOHNSON,
Texas College of Arts & Industries

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ORGANIZE INTEREST GROUP

An Interest Group connected with the Teaching of Speech to Foreign Students will be organized prior to the 1956 Convention Program of the Speech Association of America at a time and and place to be appointed by the First Vice-President of the Association.

Sponsoring Committee: Elizabeth Carr, Eva G. Currie, Rebecca E. Hayden

Additional Signers: Klonda Lynn, Ruth Kentzler, James R. Linn, Genevieve Arnold, Joseph F. Smith, Johnnye Akin, Elton Abernathy, G. M. Loney, Kathryn Mulholland, Marion McGuire, Merle Ansberry, Sumie F. McCabe

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

LOGICAL PROOF IN SALEM

Frederick W. Haberman

About six a.m. on the morning of April 7, 1830, in Salem, Massachusetts, Captain Joseph White was found dead in bed. On his left temple was a mark of considerable violence, and near the region of the heart, thirteen stab wounds. Within a few days a Committee of Vigilance was formed with a mandate to "interrogate every individual touching the murder" and financed by a thousand dollars from the nephew of the murdered man. On May 2, four men, including Richard Crowninshield, Jr., were arrested for the murder on the testimony of a prisoner in the New Bedford jail who said that he had heard them talk about stealing an iron chest of Captain White's. On May 14, Captain Joseph Knapp, Sr., a shipmaster of Salem, received a letter from Belfast, Maine, which had been intended for his son Joseph Knapp, Jr. The writer of the letter stated that on April 2 he had learned the details of a conspiracy and that he wanted $350 as the price of quiet. The Captain showed the letter to his son Phippen who said that the letter meant nothing to him. The next day he showed the letter to his other two sons, Joseph and Frank, who advised him to give it to the Committee. An emissary of the Committee then turned up John Palmer in Belfast. Assured that he would not be prosecuted, Palmer said that on April 2, while he was visiting in the Crowninshield home, Frank Knapp and another man came to the house. Later that day, he said, he was invited by George and Richard Crowninshield to participate in the murder of Captain White and to share in the payment of $1000 to be made by Joseph Knapp, Jr.

Joseph and Frank were arrested. On May 29, three days after being imprisoned, Joseph signed a confession. Some personal history makes the confession understandable. Joseph had married a niece of Captain White's, but against the wishes of the old captain. The captain, a well-to-do man, drew up a new will leaving the niece only $15,000. Joseph supposed (erroneously) that if this new will were destroyed and if the old man died intestate, one half of his estate (possibly $100,000) would pass to the niece. His confession states that he mentioned this thought to his brother and that Frank proposed Richard Crowninshield as the assassin. Joseph met Richard on April 2. "I told Richard Crowninshield how matters stood, and that I had taken the Will of Captain White either that day or the day before. . . . Richard Crowninshield then showed me the tools he would do it with, which were a club and a dirk." The confession goes on to say that Frank reported "after dinner" on April 7th on the events of the previous evening. He said that "Richard

Mr. Haberman (Ph.D., Cornell University, 1947) is chairman of the Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin.

Crowninshield met him, I think, in Brown Street, in Salem, about ten o'clock in the evening, and that he, Richard, left him and came round through the front yard, passed through the garden gate, pushed up the back window and got in by it; and passed through the entry, by the front stairs into Captain White's chamber; and that he struck Captain White with the club above named, while asleep, and after striking him he used the dirk, and hit him several times with the dirk, and covered him up, and came off, and met my brother again in Brown Street, or by the Common, I think, about eleven o'clock."

About two weeks later Richard Crowninshield, with two silk handkerchiefs, hanged himself in his cell. He left no note. But a report of a conversation exists. It is thought that Franklin Dexter, counsel for the defense, may have explained to Richard the law concerning principal and accessory. Since an accessory to a murder requires a principal for his existence, Richard may have thought that by removing himself as principal it would then be impossible to convict Frank as accessory, or alternatively, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to convict Frank as principal in the second degree.

On July 23 a special term of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts convened, but the trial of Frank as a principal "present, aiding, and abetting" did not begin until August 3. For at least three days, Daniel Webster had been preparing to participate in the prosecution, probably at the request of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General, who were quite old, and of White's nephew, from whom he received the fee of $1,000. After ten days of testimony, Dexter spoke for six hours in summation, Webster for eight. The jury deliberated for twenty-five hours, was unable to agree on a verdict, and was discharged. The next day, on August 14, the second trial of Frank Knapp began. On August 20, six hours after the cause had been submitted to them, the jury reached a verdict of guilty. Frank Knapp was hanged on December 28.

Webster was active in the prosecution of Joseph Knapp when he came to trial from November 9 to November 15 as accessory before the fact to the murder of Captain White. His confession being admitted as evidence, Joseph's doom was sealed. He was hanged on December 31.

Twice Webster used his massive powers to secure the conviction of Frank Knapp. His speeches at the time of delivery were given great acclaim. Typical of that acclaim is the comment of John Nichol writing about the reconstructed version that was published about two months after the end of the trials: "The terrible power of the speech and its main interest lie in the winding chain of evidence link by link, coil by coil, round the murderer and his accomplices. One seems to hear the bones of the victim crack under the grasp of a boa-constrictor." But there are those who have had misgivings. Typical of them is William L. Moody who wrote to a friend in 1891: "The conviction was really beyond and against the evidence and was an example of judicial murder."

The question before the authors of this book, then, is this: did Webster go beyond the evidence in his speeches asking for the conviction of Frank Knapp? To find the answer Howard A. Bradley, late Professor of Speech at Dartmouth College, and James A. Winans, Professor Emeritus of Public Speaking at Dartmouth College, have examined the evidence piece by piece, the law statute by statute, and the speech word by word. They have brought to bear a vast equip-

ment of knowledge in the law, experience in research, and skill in rhetorical analysis.[1]

In a sense the authors never tell us precisely or in detailed discourse what to think on the main question at issue. Rather, they ask us to think for ourselves, providing us meanwhile with copious hints along the way. In a footnote they say: "We believe that most readers of this book will wish to scrutinize the evidence in order to see how the case worked out and to be able to judge, as they read the closing speeches, whether a given argument has a sound basis of testimony back of it, or whether the evidence is distorted or overvalued. Many have deemed Webster's speech unanswerable, and among the many were teachers of public speaking, including the writers of this book, before we studied the evidence." An attentive reader does not miss the hint in that last sentence.

The form taken by the book is the outward expression of this inner conception that we must individually make up our own minds on the issue. In six brief chapters, totalling only 32 pages, they furnish biographical comments on the three families involved in the tragedy and explain the events leading up to the trials. Then in about 80 pages they present the evidence elicited at the trials. The problem of presentation is a knotty one. The authors say: "A summary of the evidence will not satisfy the critical reader. No summary we have found is satisfactory, and we doubt if we could make a better one. Some of the evidence was summarized in the original reports and we have summarized more, and we have cut out some minor details; but to go further would defeat the purpose of the book, which is to give a clear picture of the case 'without prejudice.' . . . no one can understand these trials, or get much pleasure from reading the book, without knowing the evidence, with its quirks and turns, and noting the struggles between lawyers and witnesses and between lawyer and lawyer."

The authors cannot solve the problem of presentation by printing all the evidence that has been lying "undisturbed for many years in newspapers, pamphlets, letters, diaries and official records." Quantity alone makes that procedure economically wasteful. It is a scholarly waste as well, since not every jot and tittle of evidence is required for the main purpose. But the authors must find the materials, prune them to the things that count, select with impartiality, and invent techniques for presenting them.

The authors rely primarily on the Q and A method of reporting the evidence from each pertinent witness, interpolating summaries of testimony, and inserting occasional lines of their own to keep the narrative running. The evidence is grouped into large categories; for example: "The Corpus Delicti," "The Conspiracy," "Frank Knapp's Presence At The Murder." The presentation is impressive. We obtain what is needed as a basis for reasoning about Webster's speech. No other way could have achieved the same results. If the reader is sometimes puzzled, even lost at a particular moment while going through the evidence, the fault may be traceable to the avoidance of typographical aids, such as quotation marks, systematic indentation, changes in font, and the like; or traceable to interpolated summaries that are cryptic; or to bewildering alternation of summary and question and answers; or to extreme brevity

[1] *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder.* By Howard A. Bradley and James A. Winans. Columbia, Missouri: Artcraft Press, 1956; pp. 230. $3.12.

and disregard of transition that make narrative jerky.

These are more or less minor blemishes on a difficult assignment successfully carried out. For no verbatim report was ever made of the testimony of witnesses or of the speeches by defense and prosecution in these trials. The present version has been constructed by the authors from newspaper accounts, a dozen or so pamphlet accounts, the official reports of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, a variety of unpublished materials in the Essex Institute of Salem, and so on. It is unlikely that they missed anything in Salem even remotely connected with the murder from the geography of the city to the marginal jottings on a pamphlet. Brief their presentation of the evidence may be; still it is the fullest available. And undoubtedly the most accurate.

The summation speech by Dexter, which is a remarkably keen venture in argument, and the excerpts of the Webster summation, lead to the book's natural climax, a reprinting of the reconstructed version of Webster's speech as published on October 28, 1830. With the background of evidence we have been given, we see the speech in a new light. We have at our disposal almost as much information as Webster and in some instances more accurate information. Aided by the Bradley-Winans footnotes, we read the speech with sharper insight.

This book, then, is a study in invention. It goes behind Webster's speech, giving us the facts and the testimony upon which the speech was built and the requirements of the law that had to be met; it provides in one place where it can be comprehended in one or two sittings all of the evidence available to Webster on the main point at issue. At what time was the murder committed? Was Frank actually on Brown Street? At what time? If he was there was he in any position to aid the murderer in any way? Could he, for instance, see the lights in the windows of Captain White's bedroom? Can he legally be made a principal? Can his brother's confession legally be admitted as evidence? These and other questions along with Webster's answers constitute a study in the use of evidence for logical proof. Here there is no attempt to deal significantly with emotional or ethical proof, nor to rummage into every nook and cranny of Webster's mind to discover from what source he took every analogy, every metaphor, every aphorism. *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder* is no *Road to Zanadu.*

Inevitably, however, we go beyond observations on logical proof alone. We can appreciate as never before Webster's resources of amplification, his instinct for narrative, his effortless ease in drawing character, his skill in maximizing and minimizing while yet retaining an air of ordinariness and confident ease, his aptness in aphoristic phrasing, his power in climax, his mastery of summary, his ability to apply generalizations on human conduct to the case in hand. This book is not only a case book in logical proof; it can also serve as the basis for a study of Webster's constructive imagination. Webster could understand; then he could "see"; then he could invest the verbal expression with emotional attributes. To illustrate this point, we might set down the two versions of a celebrated passage from the trial. The version printed first is excerpted from the summation speech at the first trial and comes from a pamphlet by Dutton and Wentworth.

> At the blessed hour when of all others repose is soundest, the murderer goes to his work. In the silence and darkness he enters the house. He does not falter, there is no trembling of the limbs, his feet sustain him. He passes

through the rooms, treads lightly through the entries, ascends the stairs, arrives at the door. There is no pause. He opens it. The victim is asleep, his back is towards him, his deaf ear is uppermost, his temples bare. The moonlight plays upon his silver locks.

One blow, and the task is accomplished!

Now mark his resolution, his self-possession, his deliberate coolness! He raises the aged arm, plunges the dagger to the heart—not once but many times—replaces the arm, replaces the bedclothes, feels the pulse, is satisfied that his work is perfected and retires from the chamber. He retraces his steps. No eye has seen him, no ear has heard him. He is master of his own secret, and he escapes in secret.

The other version is excerpted from Webster's reconstruction of the speech published two months after the trial and which is the version almost everyone knows.

The deed was executed with a degree of self-possession and steadiness equal to the wickedness with which it was planned. The circumstances now clearly in evidence spread out the whole scene before us. Deep sleep had fallen on the destined victim, and on all beneath his roof. A healthful old man, to whom sleep was sweet, the first sound slumbers of the night held him in their soft but strong embrace. The assassin enters, through the window already prepared, into an unoccupied apartment. With noiseless foot he paces the lonely hall, half lighted by the moon. He winds up the ascent of the stairs and reaches the door of the chamber. Of this he moves the lock, by soft and continued pressure, till it turns on its hinges, and he enters, and beholds his victim before him. The room was uncommonly open to the admission of light. The face of the innocent sleeper was turned from the murderer, and the beams of the moon, resting on the gray locks of his aged temple, showed him where to strike. The fatal blow is given, and the victim passes, without a struggle or a motion, from the repose of sleep to the repose of death! It is the assassin's purpose to make sure work, and he yet plies the dagger, though it was obvious that life had been destroyed by the blow of the bludgeon. He even raises the aged arm, that he may not fail in his aim at the heart, and replaces it again over the wounds of the poniard! To finish the picture, he explores the wrist for the pulse! He feels it, and ascertains that it beats no longer! It is accomplished. The deed is done. He retreats, retraces his steps to the window, passes out through it as he came in, and escapes. He had done the murder. No eye has seen him; no ear has heard him. The *secret* is his own, and it is safe!

Bradley and Winans are neither idolators nor debunkers of Webster; they are objective analysts. When Webster is at his most eloquent, they are at their most incisive. They remark about one of his passages: "It will be seen that this is plain bluff if one scans the evidence." Having reported an example of Webster's humor in cross examination, they observe that Webster's humor often reminds one of the old rhyme—

> The sportive ox and festive cow
> Hilarious hop from bow to bow.

In a footnote they attach a homely sentiment to the peroration of Webster's speech in the prosecution of Joseph Knapp. Webster says that there is "not the slightest extenuating circumstance" in Joseph's guilt, and concludes: "From first to last, from conception to execution, from detection to punishment, it is all dreadful! dreadful! dreadful!" The authors comment:

> One who has the greatest admiration for the oratory of Daniel Webster and who may agree that the deeds of Joe Knapp were diabolically dreadful, may feel while reading that paragraph that it is the most 'dreadful' thing the godlike Daniel ever said. . . . Still it may be a relief for us smaller folk to think that he was not always sublime.

Professor Winans signs a footnote which gives us a final measure. Having quoted many renowned critics who give high praise to Webster, among them Goldwin Smith and Henry Cabot Lodge, Professor Winans says:

> We must humbly bow before Goldwin Smith and Henry Cabot Lodge, men of great ability; but as I go through the laborious process of proof-reading, I hesitate a bit. They are thinking only of the standard edition of Webster's speech, with little or no knowledge of the story of the evidence. Perhaps I have worked over the

speech so long that I cannot now make a proper response . . . ; but, knowing the eloquence is in the speech, the words that come to me now are *power, skill, shrewdness, cleverness.*

AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESSES: 1740-1952. Edited by A. Craig Baird. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956; pp. xiii+301. $4.50.

This new anthology of American public address includes the texts of thirty-eight speeches by twenty-six outstanding speakers—preachers, lawyers, politicians, lecturers, and professional men. The roll includes Jonathan Edwards, Patrick Henry, James Madison, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Stephen A. Douglas, Abraham Lincoln, William Lowndes Yancey, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Wendell Phillips, Henry Ward Beecher, Robert Green Ingersoll, Henry W. Grady, Booker T. Washington, William Jennings Bryan, Albert Jeremiah Beveridge, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Robert M. La Follette, Samuel Gompers, William E. Borah, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Adlai Stevenson. Of the so-called foremost American orators included in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address* edited by W. Norwood Brigance, and the supplementary volume edited by Marie K. Hochmuth, twenty-three are here represented by one or more speeches. Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Hart Benton, Susan B. Anthony, George W. Curtis, Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Dwight L. Moody, Clarence Darrow, Theodore S. Parker, Phillips Brooks, Rufus Choate, Jeremiah S. Black, William M. Evarts, Charles W. Eliot, Edwin A. Alderman, Charles Sumner, and James G. Blaine are not represented. Baird has chosen for representation in his book James Madison, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Adlai Stevenson, who are not the subjects of essays in the volumes edited by Brigance and Hochmuth.

The student of American public address will encounter no surprises in the speeches chosen for this anthology. With a few possible exceptions the texts provided are those of addresses long familiar to all who know the course of American oratory: Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address," Patrick Henry's "Liberty or Death," Daniel Webster's "Reply to Hayne," Henry W. Grady's "The New South," and William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" are typical. The selections thus suggest at once a limitation and a virtue: Anyone seeking innovation will not find it here; but whoever wishes a compendium providing the time-tried and tested models of American eloquence will hardly find a more convenient source.

Professor Baird has provided for each speaker a short biographical note and for each speech an introductory statement. These aids are helpful, and without robbing the reader of the task of exercising his own critical faculties, they provide materials essential to forming a judgment. In the introductions, Professor Baird does a simple service too frequently neglected by the anthologists of eloquence, to the vexation of serious readers: he cites the sources of his texts.

This anthology is useful, for the editing is always competent, or better; the aids are convenient and well-designed; even the index, so often lacking in books of this sort, increases the utility of the volume. For the serious student of public address, however, the indispensable section of the book is the trenchant essay too modestly entitled "Introduction." In this essay Professor Baird discusses such topics as "Speeches and the American Mind," "Speeches and Political-Social Judgments," "Speech Criticism and Improvement In Speechmaking," "Speech as Oral Communication," "Criticism of the Ideas of the Speech," and "Speech Evaluation and Truth." Even if the views here expressed did not justify consideration for their own sake, Professor Baird's life-long devotion to rhetorical criticism and the impact of that devotion on contemporary scholarship should and no doubt will make this introductory essay required reading in many a seminar in rhetoric, criticism, and public address.

This review would be incomplete without a word of commendation for the publisher, who has produced a book in a format both useful and attractive.

BOWER ALY,
University of Missouri

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: 1734-1832. By Gerrit P. Judd, IV. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955; pp. vi+389. $6.00.

Judd's purpose has been to discover in detail the relationship between the British ruling classes and the more than five thousand men who sat in the House of Commons during the years 1734-1832, a subject of considerable interest to historians during the past three or four decades. Their analyses, however, in his opinion, have been necessarily defective because their conclusions have been based on haphazard sampling of only a fraction of the available ev-

idence and their classifications have proceeded from what he calls a literary rather than from a sociological view.

From his assumption that family background, education, occupation, and wealth are the most important conditions which determine social classes, Judd derived specific questions which his study attempts to answer: How many M.P.'s had connections with the peerage? What proportion had had ancestors in the House? How many belonged to politically important families? How many had gone to one of the traditionally great public schools or universities? Which of the professions predominated? How many members were in trade? How long did members of these various categories sit in the House? How old were the members? Did their age vary according to their social status, education, occupation, and wealth? And how did the representation change in character throughout the period?

Judd believes that he has found reasonably complete biographical information for more than 90 per cent of the 5,034 members who sat during 1734-1832. He recorded the data he wanted on IBM punch-cards in order to facilitate making his statistical analyses. Although new biographical information may modify his tabulations somewhat, he believes that his margin of error is small and that his main conclusions are valid.

He is aware of some of the limitations of his method. He realizes, for instance, that what he finds to be true of a group will not necessarily be true of any given individual in that group. One of the limitations which Judd apparently does not consider serious—for he does not mention it—is the difficulty of classifying men according to some of his categories. It is true that the schools attended, the age of members, and the length of their service offer little difficulty, for this kind of data can be filed into mutually exclusive categories. But classification of their professions, the degree of their relationship to the aristocracy, and whether they represented landed or commercial interests admits of far less exactness, a limitation, incidentally, of any attempt to classify the membership of the House of Commons, no matter what method is used.

For the past quarter-century, historians have been interested in the role of the ultra-conservative country gentlemen, who were listeners and voters but not speakers, and various estimates have been made as to their numbers. L. B. Namier has estimated that there were only about ninety of them sitting in 1760. Judd, however, believes that the country gentlemen were numerically stronger than any other group in the House. This difference of opinion might be understandable if one could know the difference in their bases of classification.

In the "Check List of Members" section, which occupies most of the book, each member is listed alphabetically together with birth and death dates, inclusive dates for each constituency for which he sat, and—most valuable for the student of this period—the main sources of biographical information.

Despite the limitations of his method, Judd's vast amount of data, his statistical tabulations, and the conclusions he draws from them deserve respectful attention, for this study is the most thorough and detailed analysis thus far attempted, and it yields results that must be taken into account henceforth by any student of the audiences that British parliamentary speakers faced.

CHARLES DANIEL SMITH,
Syracuse University

JOHN WESLEY: PREACHER. By W. L. Doughty. London: The Epworth Press, 1955; pp. 211. 18s/6d.

John Wesley, the eighteenth-century "Founder of Methodism," has been much studied and written about, but as a preacher he has been neglected. Doughty, in combing the voluminous writings of and about Wesley and bringing together his findings, has filled this gap. He is devoted to the facts, and some long-held impressions of Wesley are corrected, but his objective is partisan: building up the hero-image for a denominational following. This, together with the religious stereotypes and the "inspirational" use of Wesleyan hymns, will lead some to discount the book's merit.

Of particular interest to students of public address is Wesley's large experience with mass audiences of various kinds. Here we get a good picture of the times and the part played by oral communication. We note also a significant audience-adaptation in Wesley's clear differentiation between preaching to groups classified as "believers" and those classified as "unbelievers." With the latter he stressed the means of salvation and with the former he stressed "going on to perfection."

The contradiction suggested by Wesley's scholarly published sermons and his tremendous following among the common people has never been resolved. What relationship exists between what he wrote and what he actually preached? It would seem, on the basis of the

limited evidence available, that his published sermons reflect fairly accurately what he preached to *educated* groups, but his sermons to the masses, no doubt, were popular adaptations. At any rate, there are reports of persons who heard him in large gatherings which suggest that he made rather wide use of stories and personal experiences, whereas his published sermons are almost entirely lacking in such materials.

Further understanding of Wesley's popularity (apart from the unrest of the times which favored any leader of dissent) may come from the assumption that he practiced, to some extent at least, what he wrote on the subject of preaching. Even though he was an out-of-doors preacher much of the time (forced into this role by circumstances), he was greatly opposed to shouting and to every kind of artificiality in delivery. "Endeavor to speak in public," he wrote in a pamphlet to the clergy, "just as you do in common conversation," with "a natural, easy and graceful variation of the voice, suitable to the nature and importance of the sentiments. . . ." He was opposed also to long sermons: "People imagine the longer a sermon is, the more good it will do. This is a grand mistake. The help done on earth, God doth it Himself; and He doth not need that we should use many words."

Additional light is thrown upon the character of Wesley's published sermons by his scorn for the attitude of some of his clerical followers in disparaging what they had previously preached. "I heard a good man say long since," he wrote on one occasion, " 'Once in seven years I burn all my sermons; for it is a shame if I cannot write better sermons now than I could seven years ago.' Whatever others can do, I really cannot. I cannot write a better sermon on the Good Steward than I did seven years ago; I cannot write a better on the Great Assize than I did twenty years ago; I cannot write a better on the Use of Money than I did nearly thirty years ago; . . . Perhaps, indeed, I may have read five or six hundred books more than I had then, and may know a little more history or natural philosophy than I did; but I am not sensible that this has made any essential addition to my knowledge in divinity."

Wesley was speaking of sermons which expounded the basic doctrines of the Christian faith and he undoubtedly had in mind those which were addressed more particularly to an educated public (such as the published sermons), for—as we have already suggested—there must have been much of the ephemeral in his specific adaptations to popular audiences. Then, too, we must keep in mind that Wesley never served as a pastor to a settled congregation and that his remarks were addressed to preachers who would not for long remain in one place. He was the spokesman for Methodism's "itinerant ministry," and he himself was the exemplar. Over a period of fifty years he traveled 250,000 miles and preached more than 40,000 times, an average of fifteen times a week.

E. WINSTON JONES,
Boston University

ELIAS HICKS: QUAKER LIBERAL. By Bliss Forbush. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956; pp. 355. $5.00.

Dr. Forbush, himself a Quaker, has written with understanding and an obvious relish about the life and times of the beloved Quaker Liberal, Elias Hicks. While the chief purpose of the study was to show the influence of Elias Hicks upon the Quakers of his time and his leadership in the Liberal element during the Quaker separation of 1827-1829, Forbush has also produced an excellent biography of a man, and a very worth-while rhetorical study of Elias Hicks the speaker.

Forbush develops the importance of Hicks to the Quaker movement in a series of chapters tracing his growth in his own locale on the Hempstead Plain of Long Island, his work as an itinerant minister, his labors as an elder in his church, his long preaching tours to New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, and Indiana, and his clashes with the evangelical Quakers.

As Forbush himself states, "No Quaker can write impartially of the separation in the Society during 1827 to 1829 . . . but the story of Elias Hicks obviously means a full presentation of the Liberal point of view." The author indeed does not conceal his prejudice for this aspect of the split in his church, but he does give ample space to the Evangelical group.

As a biography, *Elias Hicks* is first rate. Hicks the man emerges as a real flesh and blood character, devout, kindly, intense, almost painfully perfect on one occasion, pitifully human on another. Both the outward war he conducted with what he regarded as the earthly sinfulness of his fellow Quakers, and his inward struggle to perfect himself in the eyes of God, are dramatically told. Perhaps in his letters to his beloved wife, Jemina, in which he counsels her on matters of operating the farm and begs,

often apparently in vain, for her answering letters, the warmest picture of Hicks emerges.

Of primary interest to teachers of Speech is the information given about Hicks the speaker. While not intended as a formal, rhetorical study, the book contains a considerable amount of material on Hicks' speechmaking. Most of this evidence is scattered through the book, but a large portion of one chapter, "The Written and Spoken Word," is devoted exclusively to his speaking.

In his preface, Forbush indicates his concern with the speechmaking of Elias Hicks and his general evaluation of this man as a speaker:

> In a day when Quakers prefer ten-minute talks, and the typical Protestant minister turns to ritual to fill half the time occupied by sermons in his grandfather's day, it is hard to appreciate how breathless congregations numbering several thousand listened to Elias Hicks speak from forty minutes to two hours or more. To those who heard him . . . his words came with soul-stirring power. As an orator he has been classed with Webster, Clay, and Everett; but it was his message that drew people to him —the message of the Light of God within man. . . .

Chapter XIV is concerned with many of the criteria of rhetorical criticism. Forbush discusses Hicks' audience, his appearance when speaking, his style, his delivery, and his employment of the dramatic introduction. Included is an analysis of one of his sermons indicating the arrangement of the material. However, Hicks' subjects and the logical development of those subjects are discussed in almost every chapter in the book.

For those who desire to become acquainted with a powerful American preacher, as well as for those who are interested in the Quaker movement per se, this book is highly recommended.

DAVID C. RALPH,
Michigan State University

HENRY WATTERSON: RECONSTRUCTED REBEL. By Joseph Frazier Wall. Introduction by Alben W. Barkley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xiii+362. $6.00.

There are two common modes of handling biography. One is straight reporting; the other is an analytical placing of the man within his time. The first can be deadly dull; the second can miss a true picture of the time *and* the man as far as Freud missed a true picture of the human being. Professor Wall has carefully steered a course between the two.

One might not easily guess that the writer's field is history. He has set his mind to the task of making this fiery little Kentuckian live and breathe again, and his clear understanding of the period's history serves as an unobtrusive tool. If there is a weakness in the style, it lies in too much day-by-day reporting of the subject's life.

This reader was somewhat astounded at the length and breadth of Watterson's career. It was no surprise to read that Marse Henry was earlier and longer at the business of "healing the wounds" than was Henry W. Grady. (Attention, Speech teachers: Grady's reputation proves that the pen is not mightier than the spoken word.) But Watterson antedated and outlasted the stresses of the post-bellum era, 1865-1898; he played a minor role in the Civil War and a major one in the imperial growth of the United States.

In any and all periods, Henry Watterson was "border state," tailor-made for Louisville and the great valley in which it lies. He was on the "border" between James K. Vardaman and Theodore Roosevelt on the Negro question, between Bob Toombs and Simon Cameron on Civil War and post-war issues, between Tom Watson and Alton B. Parker on corporate wealth. He could spend four years working and fighting for the Confederacy and still be the good friend of Horace Greeley. And because he stood so often at a point of balance, he was often able to tip the scales one way or the other—or at least, to be on the winning side.

One fact is brought pretty sharply into focus: there isn't any such thing as a uniform southern mind. Watterson could never have touched hands with Ben Tillman on imperialism, with Watson on agrarian policy, with Jim Hogg on the control of capital, or with Grady on the path to reconstruction. Watterson was just one more rugged southern individualist. All of which may explain the paradoxical fact that these "sectionalists" could (then, and now) operate effectively only in support of a "national" man on national issues.

Professor Wall has set down in a fair, round hand the life of a border state leader and the melee into which he was thrown. He is a fairly competent writer, a good culler of material, and a more than competent interpreter of men and events. All of which makes him helpful to those who want to know more

about two great transitional periods in American history.

LINDSEY S. PERKINS,
Brooklyn College

THE AGE OF REFORM: FROM BRYAN TO F. D. R. By Richard Hofstadter. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955; pp. 328+xx. $4.50.

The Age of Reform is the third of Mr. Hofstadter's brilliantly written volumes on American history, concerned chiefly with the post-Civil War Period. From the study of the impact of evolution (*Social Darwinism in American Thought*, 1944) and the finely wrought biographical essays on *The American Political Tradition* (1948), he has advanced to an analysis of motivation in American reform movements. His principal concern is with the Populist revolt, the Progressive surge, and the New Deal.

The book was inspired, he reports in the introduction, "by the need for a new analysis from the perspective of our own time." It is this perspective, one suspects, that provides the fundamental hypothesis of the book, an hypothesis that is applied most convincingly to the Progressive movement.

In a lecture in the spring of 1954 on "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt" (subsequently published as an essay in Daniel Bell's collection, *The New American Right*, 1955), Mr. Hofstadter argued that the current radical, anti-intellectual conservatism in America is occasioned by a threat to political status. The pseudo-conservative, for the most part, is one of the less educated members of the middle class. He is, typically, an old-family, Anglo-Saxon Protestant, or a new rich, second or third generation Catholic. In the former instance his status is threatened by the rising mass, in the latter he is striving for status, and in either case, impelled by a kind of paranoia, he seeks status in an intense Americanism, brought into focus by the disloyalty charges he hurls at his political enemies, the intellectuals, the liberals, and the people "soft" on Communism.

In a like manner Mr. Hofstadter explains Progressivism as a movement arising, in a time of prosperity, out of a threat to political status. The Progressives, Theodore Roosevelt in particular, were old-family Protestants, rich in the heritage of moral precept, long in the tenure of office, but, at the turn of the century, threatened politically by the madness of Bryan and the Populists and displaced in business by the new and ruthless captains of industry. Unified by their own high calling, they preached the individualistic and persuasive rhetoric of Protestant ethics, railed at the trusts, and undermined the Populists by espousing their most cherished reforms. The argument is convincing when illustrated by the political careers of Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt, but it scarcely fits LaFollette. Nor does the explanation seem adequate for the Progressive espousal of reforms (initiative, referendum, recall, direct election of senators) which yielded so much control to the masses.

It is less easy to apply the political status hypothesis to the Populist uprising. For one thing, Populism was nourished by economic distress, a fact which Hofstadter acknowledges but minimizes. He rejects, with convincing argument and documentation, John Hicks' (*The Populist Revolt*, 1932) reliance on the Turner thesis—that the disappearance of the frontier closed the safety valve which had in earlier decades been accessible to the restless and discontented but he hardly gives sufficient weight to Hicks' economic argument.

The distress of the farmer, West and South, was real enough, but the revolt rested, Hofstadter says, not simply on economics but on the irreconcilable tension between the farmer's actual condition and his mental image of what the American farmer ought to be. His Utopia was in the past, in the Jacksonian tradition. He conceived of the farmer as an heroic yeoman, the cornerstone of the Republic, who lived in communion with a beneficent nature; and who by his own virtue and industry wrought out for himself peace and prosperity. Individual failures might be explained by a lack of virtue or industry, but to the Populist orators and pamphleteers the degradation of a class could be accounted for only by a simple dualism: "the robbers and the robbed," the conspiring monied interests and their victims. So it is the *rhetoric* of the Populists that engages Mr. Hofstadter's attention—not "mere rhetoric" of purple patches, but the value system, the verbalized ethics of a Protestant yeomanry that intensified the consciousness of kind in a group, that walled off and condemned the evil opposition, and that became in itself a powerful motivating factor, not independent of the economic base but rising above it as a more powerful force.

In the New Deal, Hofstadter finds much that is "strongly reminiscent of Progressivism," but he is impressed more by its departure from than by its adherence to the earlier patterns of reform. Ordinarily it is the reformers who denounce injustice and arouse moral sentiments.

The New Deal had its "literature of inspiration and indignation, its idealistic fervor, its heroes and villains," but it derived its inspiration more from engineering, ("Machiavellian social engineering," Peter Vierek says in another connection) administration, and economics than from morals and uplift. In a reversal of roles, the conservatives, the critics of the New Deal rather than the reformers, vented their moral indignation and appealed to the inspirational literature of the American life. So it is in the conservatives of the New Deal period, and in the "pseudo-conservatives" of the post-war era that one must look for continuity in reform, or at least for continuity in the *rhetoric* of American reform movements.

Mr. Hofstadter's analysis is of more than usual interest and significance to the students of public address. It may, in fact, prove delusive to those of us who are already too prone to overrate the influence of the spoken word.

ROBERT D. CLARK,
University of Oregon

HOW COMMUNISTS NEGOTIATE. By Admiral C. Turner Joy, with a Foreword by General Matthew B. Ridgway. New York: Macmillan, 1955; pp. xiii+178. $3.50.

NEGOTIATING WITH THE RUSSIANS. Edited by Raymond Dennett and Joseph E. Johnson. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1951; $3.50.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES. Edited by F. Bowen Evans. New York: Macmillan, 1955; pp. xiii+222. $3.00.

THE LANGUAGE OF COMMUNISM. By Harry Hodgkinson. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1954. Originally published in England under the title, *Doubletalk*. Pp. xiii+149. $3.75.

PUBLIC OPINION IN SOVIET RUSSIA: A STUDY IN MASS PERSUASION. By Alex Inkeles. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, second printing, 1951; pp. xviii+379. $5.00.

The history, exposition, and evaluation of Communist rhetoric are all yet to be written. The small collection of books upon which this review is based constitutes a beginning, but in each of them the chief point of the author is that a comprehensive study of the theory and practice of Marxian persuasion is very much needed. Preliminary investigation indicates that speech concepts and methodologies of the Communists are carefully calculated and both skillfully and extensively utilized as a major means of controlling their own home populations.[1] As is made clear in these books and elsewhere, the Communist strategists also have a developed theory for the exploitation of discussion to further their own purposes in international negotiation.

One cogent starting point for an analysis of Communist rhetoric is found in a report presented by H. M. Spitzer at a "Washington Conference on International Communication," held on January 4, 1956, in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation. In this report, Mr. Spitzer explained: "The Western attitude is rooted in the feeling that, as a general rule, the minority should acquiesce in the will of the majority—an attitude which can be shared by a minority that has reason to hope that some day enough of the majority members may become convinced of the rightness of the minority view and join them to form a new majority. This attitude rests on the feeling that every man has as good a chance of hitting on the truth as his neighbor and that certainty is unattainable. Now this feeling is not shared by the Russians who are Communists and who not only believe that certainty is attainable but are convinced that it has been attained by their leaders who are trained in applying the method of Marxist analysis. Since this is their belief, they would act irrationally if they permitted their findings to be set aside by a majority decision, and fail in their duty if they did not apply every available means—including coercion—to make their views prevail."

In that same Conference, Paul Keczkementi proposed that the root of the difficulty in achieving a commonality of understanding with the Communists in international conferences lies not (as Spitzer had suggested) in their belief that truth has already been ascertained and therefore is not open to discussion, but in the more generalized principle of *cultural determination*. All peoples have difficulty understanding one another, Mr. Keczkementi pointed out, because their whole pattern of understandings depends upon differing acculturation factors. When considering the impenetrability of the Communists' minds in international con-

[1] See Robert T. Oliver, "The Top Communist Weapon: The Spoken Word," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, XXI, No. 14 (May 1, 1955), 1200-1203.

about two great transitional periods in American history.

LINDSEY S. PERKINS,
Brooklyn College

THE AGE OF REFORM: FROM BRYAN TO F. D. R. By Richard Hofstadter. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955; pp. 328+xx. $4.50.

The Age of Reform is the third of Mr. Hofstadter's brilliantly written volumes on American history, concerned chiefly with the post-Civil War Period. From the study of the impact of evolution (*Social Darwinism in American Thought*, 1944) and the finely wrought biographical essays on *The American Political Tradition* (1948), he has advanced to an analysis of motivation in American reform movements. His principal concern is with the Populist revolt, the Progressive surge, and the New Deal.

The book was inspired, he reports in the introduction, "by the need for a new analysis from the perspective of our own time." It is this perspective, one suspects, that provides the fundamental hypothesis of the book, an hypothesis that is applied most convincingly to the Progressive movement.

In a lecture in the spring of 1954 on "The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt" (subsequently published as an essay in Daniel Bell's collection, *The New American Right*, 1955), Mr. Hofstadter argued that the current radical, anti-intellectual conservatism in America is occasioned by a threat to political status. The pseudo-conservative, for the most part, is one of the less educated members of the middle class. He is, typically, an old-family, Anglo-Saxon Protestant, or a new rich, second or third generation Catholic. In the former instance his status is threatened by the rising mass, in the latter he is striving for status, and in either case, impelled by a kind of paranoia, he seeks status in an intense Americanism, brought into focus by the disloyalty charges he hurls at his political enemies, the intellectuals, the liberals, and the people "soft" on Communism.

In a like manner Mr. Hofstadter explains Progressivism as a movement arising, in a time of prosperity, out of a threat to political status. The Progressives, Theodore Roosevelt in particular, were old-family Protestants, rich in the heritage of moral precept, long in the tenure of office, but, at the turn of the century, threatened politically by the madness of Bryan and the Populists and displaced in business by the new and ruthless captains of industry. Unified by their own high calling, they preached the individualistic and persuasive rhetoric of Protestant ethics, railed at the trusts, and undermined the Populists by espousing their most cherished reforms. The argument is convincing when illustrated by the political careers of Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt, but it scarcely fits LaFollette. Nor does the explanation seem adequate for the Progressive espousal of reforms (initiative, referendum, recall, direct election of senators) which yielded so much control to the masses.

It is less easy to apply the political status hypothesis to the Populist uprising. For one thing, Populism was nourished by economic distress, a fact which Hofstadter acknowledges but minimizes. He rejects, with convincing argument and documentation, John Hicks' (*The Populist Revolt*, 1932) reliance on the Turner thesis—that the disappearance of the frontier closed the safety valve which had in earlier decades been accessible to the restless and discontented but he hardly gives sufficient weight to Hicks' economic argument.

The distress of the farmer, West and South, was real enough, but the revolt rested, Hofstadter says, not simply on economics but on the irreconcilable tension between the farmer's actual condition and his mental image of what the American farmer ought to be. His Utopia was in the past, in the Jacksonian tradition. He conceived of the farmer as an heroic yeoman, the cornerstone of the Republic, who lived in communion with a beneficent nature; and who by his own virtue and industry wrought out for himself peace and prosperity. Individual failures might be explained by a lack of virtue or industry, but to the Populist orators and pamphleteers the degradation of a class could be accounted for only by a simple dualism: "the robbers and the robbed," the conspiring monied interests and their victims. So it is the *rhetoric* of the Populists that engages Mr. Hofstadter's attention—not "mere rhetoric" of purple patches, but the value system, the verbalized ethics of a Protestant yeomanry that intensified the consciousness of kind in a group, that walled off and condemned the evil opposition, and that became in itself a powerful motivating factor, not independent of the economic base but rising above it as a more powerful force.

In the New Deal, Hofstadter finds much that is "strongly reminiscent of Progressivism," but he is impressed more by its departure from than by its adherence to the earlier patterns of reform. Ordinarily it is the reformers who denounce injustice and arouse moral sentiments.

The New Deal had its "literature of inspiration and indignation, its idealistic fervor, its heroes and villains," but it derived its inspiration more from engineering, ("Machiavellian social engineering," Peter Vierek says in another connection) administration, and economics than from morals and uplift. In a reversal of roles, the conservatives, the critics of the New Deal rather than the reformers, vented their moral indignation and appealed to the inspirational literature of the American life. So it is in the conservatives of the New Deal period, and in the "pseudo-conservatives" of the post-war era that one must look for continuity in reform, or at least for continuity in the *rhetoric* of American reform movements.

Mr. Hofstadter's analysis is of more than usual interest and significance to the students of public address. It may, in fact, prove delusive to those of us who are already too prone to overrate the influence of the spoken word.

ROBERT D. CLARK,
University of Oregon

HOW COMMUNISTS NEGOTIATE. By Admiral C. Turner Joy, with a Foreword by General Matthew B. Ridgway. New York: Macmillan, 1955; pp. xiii+178. $3.50.

NEGOTIATING WITH THE RUSSIANS. Edited by Raymond Dennett and Joseph E. Johnson. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1951; $3.50.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES. Edited by F. Bowen Evans. New York: Macmillan, 1955; pp. xiii+222. $3.00.

THE LANGUAGE OF COMMUNISM. By Harry Hodgkinson. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1954. Originally published in England under the title, *Doubletalk*. Pp. xiii+149. $3.75.

PUBLIC OPINION IN SOVIET RUSSIA: A STUDY IN MASS PERSUASION. By Alex Inkeles. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, second printing, 1951; pp. xviii+379. $5.00.

The history, exposition, and evaluation of Communist rhetoric are all yet to be written. The small collection of books upon which this review is based constitutes a beginning, but in each of them the chief point of the author is that a comprehensive study of the theory and practice of Marxian persuasion is very much needed. Preliminary investigation indicates that speech concepts and methodologies of the Communists are carefully calculated and both skillfully and extensively utilized as a major means of controlling their own home populations.[1] As is made clear in these books and elsewhere, the Communist strategists also have a developed theory for the exploitation of discussion to further their own purposes in international negotiation.

One cogent starting point for an analysis of Communist rhetoric is found in a report presented by H. M. Spitzer at a "Washington Conference on International Communication," held on January 4, 1956, in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation. In this report, Mr. Spitzer explained: "The Western attitude is rooted in the feeling that, as a general rule, the minority should acquiesce in the will of the majority—an attitude which can be shared by a minority that has reason to hope that some day enough of the majority members may become convinced of the rightness of the minority view and join them to form a new majority. This attitude rests on the feeling that every man has as good a chance of hitting on the truth as his neighbor and that certainty is unattainable. Now this feeling is not shared by the Russians who are Communists and who not only believe that certainty is attainable but are convinced that it has been attained by their leaders who are trained in applying the method of Marxist analysis. Since this is their belief, they would act irrationally if they permitted their findings to be set aside by a majority decision, and fail in their duty if they did not apply every available means—including coercion—to make their views prevail."

In that same Conference, Paul Keczkementi proposed that the root of the difficulty in achieving a commonality of understanding with the Communists in international conferences lies not (as Spitzer had suggested) in their belief that truth has already been ascertained and therefore is not open to discussion, but in the more generalized principle of *cultural determination*. All peoples have difficulty understanding one another, Mr. Keczkementi pointed out, because their whole pattern of understandings depends upon differing acculturation factors. When considering the impenetrability of the Communists' minds in international con-

[1] See Robert T. Oliver, "The Top Communist Weapon: The Spoken Word," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, XXI, No. 14 (May 1, 1955), 1200-1203.

ferences, he suggests that the Communists have been indoctrinated with the view that it is wrong for them to attempt to understand anything or to accept any interpretation not coming from an approved source. In other words, having been trained in a pattern of authoritarianism, individualized responses are repugnant to them.

Still a third basic difficulty in conducting negotiations with the Communists assuredly lies in the ethical view of the Marxists that the end justifies the means. The writings of Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist theorists are replete with the contention that the Communists should neglect no opportunity to deceive the opposition whenever and however possible. All nations utilize camouflage, forgery of documents, outright falsehood, and any other immoralities which promise immediate results *when they are at war*. Since Communist doctrine preaches that warfare between Communism and Capitalism is continuous, this type of war-morality is inherent in all Communist negotiating principles.

The role of rhetoric in Communist theory was well defined by Lenin when he wrote (*Works,* Moscow, 2nd ed., 1927-1930, vol. XXVI, p. 32) that the Soviet regime rests upon a balanced use of coercion and persuasion. Neither is alone sufficient; neither can be used adequately without the other. As early as 1902, in *What Is to Be Done,* Lenin wrote: "We must go among all classes of the people as theoreticians, as propagandists, as agitators, and as organizers . . . The principal thing, of course is *propaganda and agitation* among all strata of the people." Stalin reaffirmed this view, in his report to the 18th Congress of the Communist Party, when he defined political leadership as "the ability to convince the masses of the correctness of the Party's policy." The international application of these ideas was clearly expressed in an address by Lazar M. Kaganovich, First Deputy Premier of Russia, on November 7, 1955: "Revolutionary ideas know no frontiers. They travel throughout the world without visas and fingerprints."

In the books here selected, F. Bowen Evans presents a detailed and carefully factual account of the network of Communist propaganda organizations and media throughout the world. Inkeles's book has become a standard reference to the means by which public opinion is manipulated within the Soviet Union. Hodgkinson presents a glossary of Communist terms, with fascinating examples of the distortion of meaning, deliberately contrived for "the bewitchment of intelligence by means of language." As he phrases the process: "instead of fitting words to the realities of life, the words come to have an independent existence of their own and the realities tend to be distorted to fit them." As one of his many examples, he quotes Stalin (*Works,* Moscow, 1949, Vol. X, p. 51) as defining an *internationalist* as "he who unreservedly, without hesitation, without conditions, is ready to defend the USSR because the USSR is the base of the world's revolutionary movement. . . ."

Detailed reports on experience in negotiating with the Communists are presented, by many participants in international conferences, in Dennett and Johnson's *Negotiating with the Russians,* and in the very valuable account by C. Turner Joy (*How the Communists Negotiate*) of the Panmunjom Truce Conference in Korea.

Admiral Joy details, with ample illustrative material, a series of negotiating techniques which his Communist co-negotiators employed:

1. Slavish adherence to dogma, irrespective of the facts.
2. Imperturbability and persistence in the face of logical proof of the falsity of their position.
3. Wearisome and seemingly endless repetition.
4. Composition of an agenda composed of the conclusions they wish to establish, rather than of problems to be discussed.
5. Definition of terms to suit their own purposes rather than the facts. For example, General Nam Il insisted that "foreign troops" must be defined as troops in Korea under the permission of their own governments—so that all United Nations troops were "foreign," but the Red Chinese were not.
6. Creation of "incidents" (such as the charges of U. N. bombing of targets within the conference area) as a means of influencing the course of the negotiations.
7. Complete control of their own negotiating position from their headquarters (Moscow and Peiping) in order to render impossible any immediate concessions or decisions by the Communist negotiators.
8. Prolonged delay, in the "hope to exploit to their advantage the characteristic impatience of Western peoples."
9. Vitriolic abuse of the U. N. negotiators, in an effort to arouse displays of temper which could be cited as reasons for failure to achieve agreement.
10. Publicity of any and all phases of the

discussion which might be interpreted in the form of propaganda favorable to their cause.

11. Insistence upon clauses in agreements which are worded ambiguously, to facilitate later interpretation to suit their purposes.

12. Insistence upon acceptance of a veto provision governing all the machinery for effectuating agreements.

13. Introduction of spurious issues to be used as bargaining points.

14. Rationalistic distortion of facts "to select out of the whole truth certain parts, which, if put together in a particular way, produce a conclusion exactly contradictory to the whole truth."

15. Denial of agreements which have been reached, through the medium of "re-interpretation" of them.

16. Utilization of their most intelligent and capable members as spokesmen (regardless of their rank), while the real head of the delegation may remain completely voiceless in the background—but always available to signal to the spokesman when he approaches the limits of his authority.

Noting that the Korean truce "profited Red China enormously in prestige and influence throughout Asia" and "assisted, rather than deterred, subsequent Communist aggression," Admiral Joy concluded that hereafter, "We should enter negotiations with Communism when, *and only when*, negotiations serve the cause of freedom best."

In view of the agreement tentatively reached at the "Summit Conference" in Geneva, in 1955, that (as expressed by President Eisenhower), "there is no alternative to peace," it appears that the free world will in the future do considerable negotiating with the Communists. It is the conviction of the authors of these books that free world statesmen are desperately in need of a far better comprehension than they have manifested of the Communist theory and practice of rhetoric. It may be that the Speech profession can help them to achieve this understanding. In any event, the investigation of Communist rhetoric has been too long delayed and is urgently to be recommended.

ROBERT T. OLIVER,
Pennsylvania State University

JULIUS CAESAR. By William Shakespeare. Edited by T. S. Dorsch. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. lxxiv+166. $3.25.

T. S. Dorsch's new Arden edition, though it embraces a wonderfully annotated text, enhances but slightly one's appreciation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* as a stage-play. The present edition stands manifestly in the shadow of previous ones concerning matters of dating and source; but the Dorsch Introduction is thick with private opinions which appear to owe nothing to any previous editor or commentator. It is distinguished, for example, by a section on "The Disintegrators," which undertakes at least to establish for this drama Shakespearean authorship. The "Language and Imagery" section, further, is notable for "It is impossible that Shakespeare would not know the meaning of the Latin word *brutus*, . . . 'I. Lit., *heavy, unwieldy, unmovable.* II Trop., *dull, stupid, insensible, unreasonable,*'" and "Professor Spurgeon has perhaps done less than justice to the consistency and interest of the imagery of *Julius Caesar*."

Something rather less than justice has been done here to the consistency and interest of this play as a developed work of art. Dorsch is ready enough to take issue with predecessors (e.g. Hazlitt, Hudson) who are not now alive to defend themselves—or to pair off nineteenth-century commentators (e.g., Fleay, Wright) in conflict over relatively unimportant issues (with occasional side-line signals from the editor). Unfortunately, Dorsch's Introduction does not quite emerge into the critical arena of this century, tending rather to convey the erroneous impression that *Julius Caesar* is an old-fashioned play with little to say to the present generation.

Under "the Source," the editor advances, with conviction, that "Shakespeare's wording in a few lines seems to show that he knew the *Caius Iulius Caesar* . . . of *A Mirror for Magistrates*." The "Shakespeare's Treatment of the Source" section, however, leaves its subject at about the same point to which Skeat, Tucker Brooke, and Dover Wilson previously had carried it. In this latter section Dorsch's few tentative comments on dramatic structure are set forth—though with strong indebtedness to other writers, for this editor establishes here no meaningful pattern of total drama.

When Dorsch asserts that "Shakespeare shows [Caesar] as the darling of the commons" and poses the question "Can it be doubted that Shakespeare wishes us to admire his Caesar?" the reader discovers documentation in the form of:

I had rather tell thee what is to be fear'd/
Than what I fear; for always I am Caesar.

But we good-humouredly accepted arrogance of this kind in recent English leaders who have served us conspicuously; why not in Shakespeare's Caesar? The answer is easy to come at;

Shakespeare ironically provides it in the very next line, scrupulously omitted by Dorsch:

Come on my right hand, for this ear is deaf.

(Or, as Kittredge observed, with fine accuracy, this is "not Caesar in his best estate.")

Attribution to Brutus, in the Forum scene, of "a magnanimous and calmly reasonable appeal to [the] Roman sense of independence, . . . the total effect . . . that of the most lucid simplicity" (contrasted with Anthony's "obvious rhetorical tricks") bespeaks a limited grasp both of principles of rhetoric and of the playwright's intent. Omission from "Minor Characters" of the Tribune Marullus (whose part is longer and of greater import to the play than that of Calphurnia [cf. Calpurnia, F] or that of Lucius—both included) betrays as deficient apprehension of *Shakespeare's* drama *Julius Caesar* as Edwin Booth's assignment of Marullus' "Wherefore rejoice?" speech, in performance, to Casca.

Withal, T. S. Dorsch's new Arden *Julius Caesar* presents a completely revised, carefully wrought text of the play itself; and in great measure this achievement compensates for the limitations of its Introduction. Yet readers will regret the editor's failure to extend significantly the framework articulated by Dover Wilson in his briefer Cambridge Introduction, that Shakespeare ". . . produced in *Julius Caesar* what is perhaps the most brilliant and most penetrating artistic reflection of political realities in the literature of the world."

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
Colorado School of Mines

ENGLISH STAGE COMEDY. Edited by W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955; pp. x+182. $3.50.

There is oftentimes a tendency on the part of a reviewer of a book of literary essays to refer to it as "this slender volume of criticism" or "this collection of critical observations," either of which remarks has a quality of condescension. *English Stage Comedy* is a scholarly and brilliant contribution to the canon of English criticism and needs no condescension, elegant or otherwise. It has an added merit because each essay was presented before conferences of The English Institute Program at Columbia University.

The six essays in the book are selected, according to the editor, to produce a thematically unified subject interest. In addition to this intention on the part of the editor, Mr. Wimsatt, the essays also are presented in a chronological order in respect to content. The first by C. L. Barber examines the ritualistic aspects of comedy as revealed in an interpretation of *Henry IV;* the second by Barnard Knox discovers ancient comic tradition in *The Tempest;* the third by Ray L. Heffner, Jr., investigates the plot structure of Jonson's plays, particularly that of *Epicoene* and *Bartholomew Fair* and finds the organizing principle more similar to Aristophanic comedy than that of New Comedy and its Roman contaminators; the fourth by Marvin Mudrick examines Restoration comedy with emphasis on Wycherley and Congreve and explores further eighteenth- and nineteenth-century descendants in Sheridan and Wilde; the fifth essay by Katherine Haynes Gatch presents Shavian thesis, antithesis, and synthesis as the basis for plot, character, and thought in Shaw's plays; the sixth by William Arrowsmith is concerned with a modern poet in the contemporary theatre, T. S. Eliot, and his comedies.

In the first essay Professor Barber sets up his contention that Shakespearean comedy is "fundamentally saturnalian rather than satiric" and that Shakespeare derived a pattern for his gayer moments from the theatrical institution of clowning and the "cult of fools and folly." Professor Barber emphasizes that the Falstaff comedy fuses "two main saturnalian traditions: the clowning customary on the stage, and the folly customary on holiday." Falstaff, according to Professor Barber, derives from the conventional king of misrule who suffers the fate of all such kings and becomes the ridiculous defeated figure of contempt, who disappears from the scene, taking with him all the bad luck he has caused as the Lord of Misrule.

Professor Barber elaborates upon his thesis, using *Henry IV* as his principal example to develop the relation of comedy to ritual. Much of what he has to say is certainly valid. Greek comedy probably moved from ritual to comedy and consciously or unconsciously synthesized the two at the height of the influence of Old Comedy. Liturgical drama could not preserve ritual from the inclusion of comedy as the trope became more and more illustrative and was used as a means for introducing complication, both serious and comic, into the service of the Church. Professor Barber, however, is examining another kind of ritual, that derived from holiday conventions and the Saturnalia. The difficulty is that one is not entirely justified in accepting the particular ritual of saturnalia as being so strong an influence as is implied by Professor Barber, and furthermore, there seems to be a legitimate question in establishing hol-

iday life as ritual in the sense that one might ascribe ritual to the Greek drama and to the liturgical drama. There are so many diversities of holiday conventions among nations and within nations, even if derived from a generally common source, as to make it difficult to accept the conformity of ritual in drama, as Professor Barber implies it to be.

In the second essay in the book, Professor Bernard Knox advances a theory concerning *The Tempest,* and presents that theory with lucidity and good reason. There are times when he carries his own argument too far, finding "tongues in trees, books in the running brooks," or more aptly in relation to the context of the essay, volumes in the running slaves of Plautine and Terentian comedy as translated to the world of *The Tempest.*

The initial argument is sound to a point. Professor Knox says, "A comic poet who sets his characters in action, not in the world as we know it but in one which defies our expectation, must compensate for the strangeness of the events by making the essences and relationships of the characters immediately and strikingly familiar. . . . the fantasy and originality of the setting must be balanced and disciplined by a rigid adherence to tradition in character and plot."

If one modifies tradition to mean that which is accepted as a dramatic convention in any particular society, in this particular instance, a convention of long standing, one may agree that the inherent mischief of *The Tempest* satisfies an adherence to New Comedy and its imitators in Rome. The slaves of Plautus do indeed bear a resemblance to those fantastical servants in *The Tempest,* and it is Professor Knox's intention that the reader should see clearly that the familiarity of the classical tradition in respect to slave-driven plots and excesses makes the fantastical probable and suspends disbelief for a modern as well as for an Elizabethan audience.

Professor Ray Heffner, Jr., examines the plot structure in Jonson's comedies and makes the point that the use of the neoclassical unities, for which Jonson is praised by Dryden and others, is a matter of dispute and that modern critics are inclined to look for different methods of unity than those regularized by the Italian and French critics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Professor Heffner believes that "the essential unity of Jonson's comedy is thematic. In each of his major plays he explores an idea or a cluster of related ideas through a variety of characters and actions." Professor Heffner further adds that the unifying idea is not expressed in a fully developed plot but "in a fantastic comic conceit . . . to which all the more realistically conceived characters and incidents have reference." From these declarations, Professor Heffner moves to an examination of *Epicoene* and *Bartholomew Fair* as two different examples of Jonson's art, both of which have "a similar kind of thematic unity."

The analysis of the two plays is well done and clearly presented. The argument that Jonson moves beyond Terentian regularity into comedy more similar to the extravagance and structured criticism of Aristophanes' comedies is satisfactorily advanced. Professor Heffner emphasizes that the use of extravagant caricatures as "organizing symbols" makes possible not only a probable combination of fantasy and realism in the plays, but creates "a unity of inspiration," which is responsible for the universality of great art to be found in those works not bound down by preconceived rules. It is certainly correct to declare that even if Jonson were a crusader for the adherence to neoclassical precepts and admired the "cage of the unities," he was far too great an artist not to allow free rein to his creative impulses and to rejoice in his comic conceits as well as in the criticism of his fellows made through them. Professor Heffner makes these facts patent and argues well for them.

Professor Mudrick presents an interesting résumé of Restoration Comedy and discusses those English writers, particularly Sheridan and Wilde, who in later centuries wrote a kind of comedy of manners. The essay is rather confusing in its point of view, although it is obvious that Mr. Mudrick has a particular liking for Restoration Comedy and would defend it from those who find it gross or dull. Professor Mudrick agrees that the comedy after the Commonwealth lacks the variety and vigor of the Elizabethan period, and he upholds the latter, especially as created by Jonson. He moves toward a defense of Restoration Comedy, however, and makes clear that changing audiences effect changing attitudes, which are reflected in the drama. The Restoration manners are described, and it is emphasized that such manners create an image and that image is placed upon the stage. "But to treat an image of life," says Professor Mudrick, "is not necessarily to defend or suppress its defects. Wycherley merely had less faith than his audience in the durability of manners and in their power to withstand the pressure of impulse or self-interest. The author has his rights also."

In an examination of Sheridan and Wilde, Professor Mudrick finds that the former has a second-rate talent and that the latter has no satisfactory tradition with which to work; that the former had an audience "bottle-fed on sermons and sentimental comedy" and the latter performed "before an audience of cucumber sandwiches." He sees the decline of English comedy in part because of these two factors, the attenuation of talent and the vapidness of the audience.

In her essay on Shaw's last plays, Katherine Haynes Gatch makes a number of significant points which result in a clear evaluation of the playwright's intention both as a dramatist and as a practicing philosopher. Before discussing the last plays, Miss Gatch observes the progress made by Shaw in the structural development of his earlier works, which she finds to be continued with variation and some change in the later plays. In addition to this progression in the playwright's development, Miss Gatch disclaims "the most tiresome commonplace in the criticism of Shaw's plays . . . that they are all talk and no plot," and adds sensibly enough, "Why, if these plays are not plays, should they behave on the stage as if they were?" Miss Gatch then proceeds to indicate that the particular Shavian structure, derived in part from Hegel and Marx and modified by his own temperament, is a dialectical process, divisible into three phases: thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

Miss Gatch indicates how the dialectic operates in the early plays and then moves to those plays written after *Heartbreak House* and finds in them somber colorings, motivated by "the spiritual ills of the post-war world." The complexities of mood, however, do not destroy the basic structural dialectic of the plays, as Miss Gatch so clearly indicates, nor do they negate the long range view which Shaw held as a Creative Evolutionist.

The thesis, the antithesis, the synthesis may change in proportion and may be modified relatively as they are affected by Shaw's change in point of view. Several of the later plays, it is true, appear to abandon the dialectic, particularly *The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles* and *In Good King Charles' Golden Days*. These exceptions, however, prove the rule, if one accepts Miss Gatch's argument. They "talk" well, but they do not play as satisfactorily as they might in the theatre.

Since T. S. Eliot has elected to write profound comedy for the theatre, having moved away from the moralities of his earlier dramatic experience, it is fitting that the last essay in *English Stage Comedy* should be concerned with England's present literary titan. William Arrowsmith writes learnedly on "The Comedy of T. S. Eliot" with particular emphasis on Euripides' dramatic structure as it is related to Eliot's comedy.

Professor Arrowsmith sees in the plays of Euripides and Eliot the presentation of a double reality, and that the two are connected by "a conversion or transformation of one reality to another." In Euripides, Professor Arrowsmith reminds us, a story derived from received beliefs is "converted" under dramatic pressure to another phase of reality. "The play pivots on two seemingly incompatible realities, and . . . it does not do so by denying validity to received reality, but subtly displaces it in the transfiguration of its terms." In similar fashion, but without the same result, except relatively, Professor Arrowsmith finds in Eliot that the unity of the plays depends upon the perception of the conversion from one reality to another. "Thus," he says, "the Christian component in Eliot's plays is . . . a world of greater reality intended, under the pressure of poetry, to become incarnate in the secular terms of the play."

Had Eliot communicated what he clearly saw himself there would be little need for the intellectual and spiritual failures of *The Cocktail Party* and *The Confidential Clerk* for the popular audience. It is this point which Professor Arrowsmith makes with acute and reasonable understanding. After listing the various isolated transfigurations in the two plays, as foreshadowing the double reality inherent in them, Professor Arrowsmith states that if Eliot's intention is to write a complete Christian comedy superimposed on a Greek romance, he has "over-estimated the power of Christian mysteries to reveal themselves to those who have lost the secrets of their own initiation."

The necessity for brevity in a review makes it impossible to do full justice to the six essays in *English Stage Comedy*. Each one is an important addition to the criticism of comedy, and each should be read with the care which was obviously attendant upon its writing. The one general adverse criticism of these works which might be made is that there is a tendency among the authors to forget that the plays of which they write are theatre pieces as well as the heart of English dramatic literature. An actor is often guilty of reading Shakespeare as if it were Holy Writ and not the repeated accents of living theatre. The

critic also may be inclined to the same veneration and lose himself in idolatry.

NORMAN PHILBRICK,
Stanford University

ADVICE TO A YOUNG CRITIC AND OTHER LETTERS. By Bernard Shaw. Notes and Introduction by E. J. West. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1955; pp. xvi+208. $3.00.

To the Shavian—defined by Mr. West as "a good friend to Shaw (although not necessarily one actually acquainted during his life-time) a faithful fan, and an avid reader of the works of the 'Shavian Essayists'"—the portrait of the iconoclastic Irishman that emerges from these letters will come as no surprise. Here is indeed confirmation of Shaw's friendly and generous nature, his practical helpfulness (and to an unknown), and his intellectual fairness. There are 108 items (letters, notes, postcards) in all, the bulk of which extend from 1894 to 1907, the remainder sporadically to 1928.

The "young critic" was Richard Golding Bright, now positively identified as the gallery boo-er on the opening night of *Arms and the Man* who elicited from Shaw the famous repartee: "My dear fellow, I quite agree with you; but what are we two against so many?" Add to this a half dozen other facts furnished by these letters and the editor's comments, and that is all we know of the subject of this correspondence. There are no letters of Golding Bright to Shaw.

Bright was twenty in 1894 when he wrote asking Shaw's advice on how to become a drama critic. The reply ("There is no way. . . . It happens by accident") and most of the letters that follow add a fascinating and valuable footnote to the exegesis of the many-sided Shaw. G. B. S. responded to the young man generously and straightforwardly, and for some ten years thereafter proferred sound advice and kindly criticism to his "disciple" and specifically but quietly helped him become established in journalism. In the last third of the book, from March of 1904 on, Bright has turned play-agent, and a successful one, under the aegis of Elisabeth Marbury.

There is no better statement of the value of this publication than Mr. West's own words in the Introduction: ". . . the early letters as a group and many of the later ones are written in Shaw's best vein, if not in his most perfect style; they provide much additional evidence of some of his finer qualities and characteristics; and they either offer really new information or firmly settle hitherto moot points concerning his career and his works."

Of at least two dozen statements by Shaw marked by the reviewer for quotation, he selects two. "You say you are scarcely competent to write a book just yet. That is just why I recommend you to learn. If I advised you to learn to skate, you would not reply that your balance was scarcely good enough yet. A man learns to skate by staggering about and making a fool of himself. Indeed he progresses in all things by resolutely making a fool of himself. You will never write a good book until you have written some bad ones."

After a sharply uncomplimentary review (by Bright), of most of the *Plays: Pleasant and Unpleasant*, Shaw wrote him that the review was ". . . a very promising one. Some of my 'unpleasant' achievements horrified you a little; and the fact that the feeling insisted on finding expression, and apt and forcible expression, when you would have probably rather liked to be complimentary, convinced me that you had not mistaken your profession. . . . Further, you pitched into an author without offending him, a thing that can only be done by saying your mind quite sincerely."

An earlier review of the book in the *New Yorker* censured Mr. West for the inundation of his notes. Although there is validity in the criticism, the voluminous, occasionally prolix, comments are a mine of information and explanation for the beginner. For the Shavian, in West's definition—indeed, for the non-Shavian, but moderately informed reader of theatre history—some of the notes are superfluous.

Mr. West's long and devoted study of Shaw is well known to the readers of this periodical and *ETJ*. His careful and scrupulous editing of these letters is in itself a kind of brief history of the late nineteenth-century English theatre and as such is highly recommended to the newly interested reader of Shaw as well as to the Shavian.

ALBERT E. JOHNSON,
Texas College of Arts & Industries

GRASSROOTS THEATER: A SEARCH FOR REGIONAL ARTS IN AMERICA. By Robert Gard. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1955; pp. xiv+263. $4.00.

HOW NOT TO WRITE A PLAY. By Walter Kerr. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955; pp. x+245. $3.50.

During the 1950 Convention in New York City, the authors of these two startlingly dissimilar books impinging on the question of playwriting both spoke on a panel which I still, although I was chairman, remember pleasantly and vividly. Robert Gard, Director of the Wisconsin Idea Theater, rambled quietly, shyly, vaguely, impressionistically, about his peculiar work, and left audience and chairman baffled as to just what that work entailed and exactly how he pursued it. He mentioned a book he contemplated concerning his past and present projects. This book he has produced. Walter Kerr, then on academic leave from Catholic University and just beginning, on the staff of *Commonweal,* his critical career, spoke pithily, pungently, provocatively of playwriting courses and their dubious practical value, of young playwrights and what should be done to discourage or exterminate them, and aroused immediate, heated and lengthy floor-reaction and discussion. (I seem to recall clearly dissatisfaction when I arbitrarily adjourned the meeting at 6:30). Mr. Kerr's present book takes up in the same exuberant, aggressive, "alerting" style some of the ideas expressed then.

In 1950 I said I looked forward to Gard's book because I wanted to understand what the Wisconsin Idea Theater is and felt, even after hearing him talk of it, that I had no clear conceptions about it. After two close and highly concentrated readings of *Grassroots Theater* and the expenditure of much time and energy to consideration of it, I must confess that not only do I know nothing really of the W. I. T., but honestly do not understand Gard's concept of theatre (or drama) itself. Rarely do I disagree with John Gassner, and I can subscribe to his dust-jacket appraisal: "Like no other book on theatre in recent decades," but I do not find the book "vibrant with love of the theatre"; "love of America" I will grant, but, frankly, Gard's book, despite an annoying recurrent over-modesty of phrase, is the autobiography of a greatly enlarged Messianic complex, the loving self-recording of a man who regards himself as an heroic (Lincolnesque, I gather) Johnny Appleseed of culture to the rural sections of central New York (where, we sense, Gard feels he inspired that great, probably the greatest, figure of the American educational theatre, A. M. Drummond), Alberta, and Wisconsin. The reader soon becomes alternately bored and dizzied by interminably climbing heights with the author (if no natural eminence is handy, Gard is content with the top of some preferably aged academic pile) in order that Gard may be inspired anew with a sense of his destiny: "a desire for creative expression of my own, with solitudes to nourish it, on one hand, and a fermenting drive to help establish the arts, as an essential part of American community life, on the other." Understand me: I question neither the sincerity of the desire nor the intensity of the drive. I am merely reporting upon a book, the reviewing of which has been unconscionably delayed by my fear of seeming petulant and my reluctance to seem prejudiced. But my verdict must rest: the book is turgidly and in general quite badly written (somehow the misprint "tradegy" on one of the last pages first struck me merely as another whimsical and wilful Gardism), and it is *not* a book about theatre nor is it of any real interest or value to the theatre worker, scholar, or lover.

Wally Kerr's intriguingly titled volume is something quite different. My copy is already dog-eared, tattered, almost unreadable through underlinings of devilishly shrewd or delightfully muddle-headed pronouncements, and marginal notes, interjections, imprecations, and impassioned debates of my own. I have read the book straight through several times, have quoted it or read extensively from it in half-a-dozen courses, and savored bits of it in private again and again. Ostensibly but not seriously (Heaven forbid I seem to be denying Kerr's deep and abiding, if frequently vituperative and agonized knowledge of and love for all theatre and drama) a book on playwriting, this is, in contrast to that considered above, a book for everyone working with or willingly to be humanly interested in theatre or drama. It is "a daarlin' book"—and incidentally, I hope dear Sean encounters it. It is brilliantly written, alive throughout, witty and intelligent, stimulating—often aggressively so, redolent—almost reeking—with vitality and vibrant personality (but while both wife Jean and the twin Kerr boys wander in and out most intimately and engagingly, there is nowhere the hint of a Gard-like egomania). The basic thesis (and one steadily and persuasively developed) is that the way *not* to write a play (and, thinks Kerr—and I agree—the way most practised in our theatre) is to imitate Ibsen and Chekhov. An elderly and conservative scholar and critic, a devout Chekhovian and an only slightly Protestant Ibsenite like myself may find his own Irish blood rising dangerously again and again as he faces Kerr's enthusiastic and often apparently too blindly sweeping shillelagh-on-

slaught, but he is forced to applaud the careful and convincing analysis of the difference between the problem play, the thesis play, and the propaganda play, the satisfying attack upon the current concentration on but misunderstanding of theme, with its consequent shirking of plot, and the pervasive and persuasive plea for largeness, magnificence, and wide humanity, for language, rhetoric, and poetry in our drama and theatre.

How Not to Write a Play is distinctly a book to buy, to keep, to read, to cherish, to throw violently into a corner, to retrieve—with penitence, if exasperation—from the corner, to reread. J. B. Priestley, reviewing the English edition last June, rightly segregated it from the recent spate of "turgid pompous rigmaroles" which have been penned by "droning oracles" concerning the theatre and drama of the half-century. He rightly praised its "zest, challenge, devilment." He advised all "intelligent people'" to "sample" the alert and alerting chapters of this "daarlin' book"—"which cost less than benzedrine and are safer to take." I can only add: "and which will have more lasting and more salutary effects—for the intelligent reader."

E. J. West,
University of Colorado

UNEXPECTED TRUCE. By Don Geiger. Los Altos, California: Round Table Books, 1956; pp. xi+64. $2.50.

There is a special excitement about a first volume by a contemporary poet. When the publication is, moreover, the first product of a new publishing concern, there is an added flavor of discovery. Such is the case with the attractive book titled *Unexpected Truce*. Don Geiger, the poet, is well known in the Speech field as a teacher of Interpretation at the University of California, at Berkeley, and as a contributor to professional journals. Several of the poems in *Unexpected Truce* have appeared previously in literary magazines, including the *Beloit Poetry Journal* and *Poetry*.

The book is divided into three sections. The opening poem, "Lost Land, Lost Song" is obviously intended as a foreword to set the tone of the volume. The title would seem to indicate that here is another collection of comments on the dilemma of modern man and the inevitable dissolution of his identity and of his focus on the world in which he must continue to live. Such is not quite the case. The poems are indeed comments on the irony of modern man's dilemma, but this poet has found, for himself at least, an "unexpected truce." This is a particularly apt title for the book. A "truce" is not necessarily a victory, nor a defeat. It is more nearly an attempt at balance and a temporary and civilized cessation of active hostilities. The immaculately constructed opening poem catches the balance between intellectual escapism and intelligent awareness of reality.

The first section, "ASN 16078697," contains seven poems which might be termed "war poems," but that would do them an injustice and limit them unfairly. They are poems "out of the war," but "after the fact," and thus they carry a more timeless impact than might be expected. Some have greater appeal for this reviewer than others, but that, of course, is the way poetry should be. Of particular interest, however, is the variety of structures which Don Geiger is able to manipulate unobtrusively to support and augment his content. There are examples of quatrains with carefully traditional rhyme schemes, made subtly dissonant for a modern tone. There are also highly experimental structures, and occasionally combinations of both. At no time, however, does one feel structure is a "tour de force." Here is a poet who knows his craft and understands the uses of sound patterns.

The second section of eleven poems is titled "Cold Evening" and is both witty and warm. There are puns in the manner of Donne, used deliberately, with a modern context, and the gently sophisticated pair "'A Girl Is What She Sees" and "A Girl Is Where She Goes," which follow "How Is It Down There, Dr. Donne?" are done with equal skill. Again content and structure blend and reinforce each other.

The third section of twelve poems, "Evening Work," contains the title poem, and the ingredients, in part, by which a man may achieve an "unexpected truce." The basic images and references are simple and excellently controlled, and the evaluations which the poet has put upon them are modern and intelligent. The closing lines are characteristic of much of the thinking in the book:

But for once, among the stiffened hieroglyphs
that time has chipped upon her rocky voice,
I calmly watch a flying spectre turn
and show me his surprising face, as though
a nightmare, pointing to a host of comrades,
companionably smiled, and offered rest.

As might be expected from a poet who is also an interpreter, *Unexpected Truce* is rich in the aspects which make poetry the

special province of the interpreter. The manipulations of sound, both in the rhyme position and within the lines themselves, are subtle and effective. They complement the emotional weight of the immediate reference and reinforce the total impact of the poem. The prosodic structure is skilfully handled.

The interpreter will find much to challenge his own skill, and much to reward him in audience response. The more mature students will enjoy making Don Geiger's acquaintance, and you yourself will be proud to claim him as a colleague.

CHARLOTTE I. LEE,
Northwestern University

SANTAYANA AND THE SENSE OF BEAUTY. By Willard E. Arnett. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955; pp. xviii+252. $4.50.

Except in Chapter Two, titled *Art, Beauty and Judgment*, this book is not primarily an account of Santayana's doctrine of beauty as "pleasure objectified" with its subsequent analysis of "sensuous materials," "form," and "expression" as constituents or aspects of beauty. Any further detailing of these familiar themes would indeed be quite gratuitous, so lucidly and engagingly does the master himself treat them in his little classics of aesthetic literature —*The Sense of Beauty* and *Reason in Art*.

Neither is it Williard Arnett's main purpose here to extol once again the fine artistic temper of Santayana's intellect and the delicately chiselled texture of his prose, although passing tribute to both is unavoidable.

As Irwin Edman aptly observes in a Foreword written shortly before his recent death, the "analysis cuts deeper with respect to Santayana as the artist-philosopher. The author makes beautifully and lucidly clear how profoundly the aesthetic preoccupations of Santayana affect something more than the exquisite literary surface of his work. His general point of view is dominated by art and aesthetic considerations, even perhaps particularly, when he is not explicitly writing about aesthetics." (p. xiv).

The argument, in other words, is that aesthetic analysis played much the same controlling role as a conceptual model, or frame of intellectual reference, in Santayana's broader philosophical views that mathematical analysis so obviously did in the philosophizing of men like Descartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, and Russell, or that biological science did in the philosophizing of men like Herbert Spencer, Bergson, and Dewey, according to the shifting trends and fashions of research in those other disciplines at their several times of influence.

In view of Santayana's well-known attitudes on the moral function of poetry and the poetic nature of religion, this thesis is most readily established in the area of his moral and religious philosophy. It is convincingly shown in Chapter One on *Reason, and the Good Life* that, for Santayana, "The aesthetic character of the Good is evident from its very nature: it is an ideal to be envisioned and contemplated rather than a practical possibility to be labored toward; it is a vision of the spirit, not a relation between living psyches . . ." (p. 14). Similarly in Chapter Four on *The Affinity of Poetry and Religion:* "A religion that is rooted in the heart and experiences of man gives expression, not to the literal truth about the universe, but to the actual moral needs of man. . . . Even piety, charity and spirituality, religiously conceived, are summaries of certain ideal actions and relations which can be expressed only by metaphors. . . . Therefore piety, charity, and spirituality, as religious concepts, are akin to the best poetry in so far as they express human ideals. . . . For the best poetry is not merely 'metrical and eupheuistic discourse'; it is rather the verbal interpretation of the vision of the prophet—'a momentary harmony in the soul amid stagnation or conflict—a glimpse of the divine and an incitation to a religious life.'"

But the thesis is also extended to Santayana's philosophy of science and society, and to the major categories—"essence, matter, truth, and spirit"—of his later essays on "the realms of being." In each case the argument is based on some variation of the observation that, in Santayana's interpretation, all the disciplines of sensibility and reason are "primarily imaginative products, modified according to the circumstances, needs, and interests of different individuals in different cultures and ages" (p. 58), so that science, for instance, consists merely of "'dreams abstracted, controlled, measured, and rendered scrupulously proportional to their occasions'" (p. 76) and therefore differs from the fine arts and religion "not in its origin or significance, or even remarkably in its methods, but largely in that it intends to be and is a more trustworthy guide to action" (p. 64).

Notwithstanding the plausibility and interest of all of this, however, it is disappointing that in dealing with such a theme at such a time Willard Arnett does not take the opportunity explicitly to contrast the essentially poetic conception of Santayana's philosophic enterprise

with the ostensibly different ones of our self-styled contemporary "analytic philosophers" who invariably begin by presuming to discard, into the limbo of vaguely emotive "pragmatics," all the poetic overtones of language they believe it their task to clarify. How such an appendix might begin has at least been suggested by the chapter, *World, Word, and Poet,* in Irwin Edman's own book on *Arts and the Man* (Mentor Books, New York, 1949). How that appendix would eventuate, it were rash to foretell. Nearly a hundred years after his birth (1863), but only a few years after his death (1952), it is perhaps still too soon for us to apprehend and communicate the "essence" of George Santayana under this "aspect of eternity."

WILLIAM R. GONDIN,
The City College, New York

DIE GESTALT DES GEDICHTES, SEINE SPRECHKUNDLICHE INTERPRETATION UND NACHGESTALTUNG. By Dr. Marie-Hed Kaulhausen. Göttingen: Göttinger Verlaganstalt, 1953; pp. 149.

In the foreword to this interesting book, Dr. Marie-Hed Kaulhausen states that she is writing primarily for the German teacher in the high schools and for the Speech educator in colleges. Her interest, as the title indicates, is in "the form of the poem, its oral interpretation and its presentation." In her opening chapter she states that in each poem a writer has a certain objective and that it is the task of the reader to come as near to that objective as possible, bringing forth all of the meaning that the poet had in mind. Dr. Kaulhausen sees the elements involved in bringing forth this meaning as stress, structure, tension, pause, melody, tone, tempo, volume, and pitch. She is particularly interested in the relation of the speaker or reader to the hearer. She sees a poem as "living movement." The nature and form of this movement is determined by the relationship of the speaker and the hearer. To clarify this relationship the author proposes four questions: Who is speaking? To whom does he speak? Under what external conditions does he speak? And under what internal or subjective conditions does he speak? All of these elements play an important part in the interpretation of a poem, and it must be clear to the reader whether the hearer is present, or is absent, or is the reader's own inner self.

Dr. Kaulhausen's next topics are of particular interest to anyone who has heard her read: rhythm, melody, cadence, and rhyme. Her own oral reading of poetry shows such fine sensitivity in these elements that one is naturally interested to know what she thinks of them. Her concluding paragraph in this section sums up her meaning by saying that rhythm, melody, and rhyme are of value as "outer" indications of poetic form, but that this outer form comes from the basic inner concept of the poem. She puts this theory to practice by analyzing poems of Goethe, Meyer, Borchert, Weinheber, and Rilke.

In her concluding chapter she discusses the speaking of poetry in relation to speech and general education. She sees the reading of poetry as necessarily more than an aesthetic experience. The student in reading aloud partakes of the "speech power" of the poet which the average man cannot reach within his own range of vocabulary, thought, and expression. Besides, she feels that no branch of education offers the possibilities of unfolding the personality as does speech, for it is education not only of the isolated individual but of his increasing awareness of his fellow man. This book is only one of a number of publications of Dr. Kaulhausen, and we hope to hear more from this able and sensitive educator in the future.

EUGENE BAHN,
Wayne State University

SPEECH AFTER LARYNGECTOMY. By Louis M. Di Carlo, Walter W. Amster, and Gilbert R. Herer. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1955; pp. xxiii+184. $4.00.

This book essentially is a report of a scientific investigation of the breathing and speech co-ordinations and articulatory efficiency of fifteen laryngectomized adults as compared with the breathing and speech co-ordinations of fifteen normal speaking adults. In addition to testing hypotheses concerned with breathing and speech co-ordination, and general intelligibility of laryngectomized speakers, the study purports to obtain an understanding of the speech relearning process of laryngectomized individuals and to gain an understanding of some of the variables involved in the intelligibility of speech of these individuals.

In a style consistent with scientific reporting, the literature having bearing on the subject is carefully reviewed. This review serves to point up the controversies concerning the association of respiration and phonation, the possible location of the vicarious air chamber, and the requirements for the proper functioning of the pseudo-glottis. Mention is also made of related studies on intelligibility and articulation.

The design of the study is then described in detail and procedures, instrumentation, and results discussed. Instrumentation included kymographic recording of the breathing patterns of laryngectomized and normal adult speakers. The research also analyzed the effect of rhythm, time, phrasing, articulatory accuracy upon the speech intelligibility of these two groups. The authors report a cinefluoroscopic analysis of speaking efforts of laryngectomized patients.

The data and analysis of the study lead to conclusions supporting the contention that laryngectomized individuals continue to use normal speech co-ordinations in the speech relearning process. It is recommended that the laryngectomized individual develop synchronous speech-breathing co-ordinations and voice control prior to the development of communicative speech and that as he attempts voice production, he utilize the air supply to coincide with the normal speech co-ordination.

This is a useful book to all concerned with this subject. But one who is interested in therapeutic method will be disappointed because its purpose is not to describe methods of teaching the laryngectomized individual except as stated above. It should be most useful, however, to scientific investigators in this field.

LESTER L. HALE,
University of Florida

SLOW TO TALK. By Jane Beasley. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956; pp. xi+109. $2.75.

If the art of Rhetoric is that ". . . of finding, in every given case, the available means of persuasion," then the art of Speech Pathology might be defined as that of finding, in every given case, the available means of language development. "What is advocated in the present study," says Miss Beasley, "is that the teacher should attempt to appraise the interests, attitudes, widening experiences, and motivations of the child and to select information, tools or behavior related to the child as he is at the present moment." Or, you don't *set up* a therapy pattern for a non-speaking child, you *find* it. To do so with certainty requires a depth of understanding about language which we certainly do not now possess. But we most certainly do understand better than we once did that meaning and speech are inseparable. We know, or think we know, a good deal more about meanings at sub-speech levels than we once did. We know, or think we know, a great deal more about early learning than we once did.

Slow to Talk is a serious effort to relate known and assumed data on language development to known and assumed data on personality development, and to derive a rationale for the teaching of beginning Speech. It assumes that all children must learn to talk in about the same way, and must be affected similarly by learning situations. It assumes also that these learning situations are affected by a child's not talking—especially in that he becomes a threat to his parents and his teachers, that his wants are misunderstood, and that his objectification is less. It is, of course, a development along the same lines as the Backus and Beasley *Speech Therapy with Children*, but it is not a book on therapy in the same sense. It is a book about those things which make a child learn to speak, with some advice on how to manipulate them.

In its attitudes, there is a good deal that stems from Sullivan, particularly from the "good me" and "bad me" concepts. Cameron and Erikson, Jersild (who wrote the Foreword), and Langer (oddly enough without Cassirer) are strong influences. There is quite a bit of generally accepted nursery school theory. There are a good many bibliographical references for so short a book—some influential, most of them not. There is an obvious debt to Ollie Backus. But the book, although it is not additively different from its sources, is far from a compendium. It has its own life; it reads on its own terms. Such common bits as the advice to be wary of praise, or to work with language of wide application, or for each teacher to work in her own way, or to watch for what attitudes are being taught, come through with the feeling that they ought to be because they ought to be, not because they are techniques. It is a very good book.

What is it good *for*? The dust jacket says that it is "a guide for teachers and parents of children with delayed language development." My group of parents found it confusing by itself. It could be well used with the Backus and Beasley book. It could be a base for parent-counselling sessions. It could be a great aid to a course in pre-school and elementary level language development. And it is a comfort to those who teach the teachers and parents of children with delayed language development.

PAUL C. BOOMSLITER,
New York State College, Albany

STUTTERING: A PSYCHODYNAMIC APPROACH TO ITS UNDERSTANDING AND TREATMENT. By Dominick A. Barbara.

New York: Julian Press, Inc., 1954: pp. xii+304. $5.00.

In his Foreword, Smiley Blanton says: "When I began the study of the problem of stuttering in 1910, it was almost universally accepted that stuttering was due to difficulty in breathing, and that the cure for it was persistent and constant practicing of speech exercises." When this reviewer began his formal association with a Psychiatric Service some sixteen years ago, his introduction was "Stuttering is oral aggression, and you can't do anything about it." That it has been possible to bend the two lines of approach toward each other has been because of the redefinition of neurosis, speech, and language by many students of Speech, Psychology, Philosophy, Anthropology, and a hundred other disciplines. In Psychiatry, Karen Horney, as much as anyone, made the concept of neurosis a workable one for Speech Pathology.

But the actual melding of attitudes remains to be achieved. And, as it seems now, it will have to be achieved through those disciplines which consider language. It is for that reason that Dr. Barbara's book is a disappointment. He has tried some further bending, putting the neurosis of Horney side by side with the stuttering of Johnson, and to a lesser extent of Van Riper (1939), West, Travis, and Gottlober. But it doesn't make a meld. It doesn't because it omits Freud's perceptive remark that early language and neurosis begin at the same time. And it doesn't because there is no Langer or Piaget in the hand. Dr. Barbara sees language as the means "through (which) we express our opinions, feelings, attitudes, and actions." He sees language as an output, not as deLaguna's "tool" or Cassirer's "prerequisite of the very conception of objects. . . ."

And so, what emerges is a book about neurosis, defined down toward the stuttering personality, but not expanded to stuttering. This is deliberate: Dr. Barbara says that "the diffuse feelings of frustration and discontent experienced by the individual who stutters are in part due to anxiety related to speaking situations. This does not gainsay the fact that they are mainly due to disturbances in the over-all character structure. He says that "it can well be understood that a child who stutters is subjected to many humiliations and embarrassments and much ridicule at the hands of others," but he says nothing about his sudden uncanny separation from social interaction. Actually, he essentially rejects that aspect in his objections to Fletcher. And as a book about neurosis it is a good book, clear in its theory, and often particularly clear about stutterers—or some of them. Most of the book is just this.

Of the chapters which might be directly about stuttering, "Magic in Stuttering" doesn't consider the failure of incantations, "The Speaking Situation in Stuttering" assumes the key stages of social interaction, and "Language Behavior in Stuttering" isn't about language. The last chapter is titled "Treatment in Stuttering." It begins with "Stuttering is not to be considered as an isolated disorder of the speech mechanism, but as an outward expression of a more basic character disorganization." It is highly general, of course, and follows familiar patterns, and will of itself hardly be "workable for . . . the speech teacher . . .—and the stutterer himself" as Dr. Barbara hopes. It contains some pertinent comments about theories of specific trauma, hypnotic cures, resistances and hostilities in therapy, and the use of group therapy —which last is to be used "along with and interchangeably with individual therapy."

In short, this reviewer couldn't help wishing that the references to Van Riper had been from a later edition than the 1939 one, and couldn't help feeling that of the professions, Speech Pathology must make about the least imprint in general consciousness. For Speech Pathology, the book is worth looking at, but contributes nothing that was not already available. "Anxiety begets speech disorders" still stands in opposition to "Speech disorders beget anxiety."

PAUL C. BOOMSLITER,
New York State College, Albany

LANGUAGE, THOUGHT, AND REALITY: SELECTED WRITINGS OF BENJAMIN LEE WHORF. Edited by John B. Carroll. New York: The Theology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956; pp. 279. $7.00.

In the past few months, the student of communication theory has had a virtual library of materials placed at his disposal. Caught between the deluge of new books appearing in psycholinguistics and communication and the re-publication of the older, but equally provocative writings of Piaget, Jesperson, Sapir, and Ayer, he has been kept without interruption in a state of financial bankruptcy. It is the unhappy job of this reviewer to add to his misery.

Benjamin Lee Whorf, industrial chemist by day and linguist by night, is a name to reckon with whether your private focus is restricted

to linguistics, semantics, communication, or rhetoric. The publication in this volume of nearly all of his writings, many of them heretofore unpublished or now inaccessible, is an event of considerable importance. Whorf became interested in the study of language in about 1925 and died only sixteen years later at the age of forty-four in 1941. In those sixteen years his studies of Aztec, Mayan, and Hopi languages led to the preparation of dozens of essays of linguistic significance and several longer papers, such as his essay of much broader scope on "The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language." Even in one of his earliest and very short papers entitled "The Punctual and Segmentative Aspects of Verbs in Hopi" we find evidence of the linguistic relativism for which, along with Edward Sapir, he was to become famous. In it he notes that "We are inclined to think of language simply as a technique of expression, and not to realize that language first of all is a classification and arrangement of the stream of sensory experience which results in a certain world-order, a certain segment of the world that is easily expressible by the type of symbolic means that language employs."

Whorf went on from this point of early speculation to isolate many of the specific characteristics of Middle American languages, particularly of the Hopi, which distinguish them from what he called the SAE (Standard Average European) and in the process substantiated his theory of linguistic relativity. He found, among many discoveries, that our concepts of space and time may be seriously deficient, a conclusion reached also by Alfred Korzybski and Albert Einstein. Not only do Hopi and SAE differ in their construction of individual and mass nouns and in their symbolic representation of time, but in their tenses and in other aspects of syntax as well. Perhaps most importantly, Whorf follows these linguistic predilections through to their consequences in thought and behavior, finding in this pursuit a basis for Western materialism, our dualistic views of the universe, our routinizing of daily life, and our emphasis on practicality.

In these essays there is much that should be and has been questioned, a multitude of issues that will require years of painstaking effort to resolve. But no student of language can afford to be ignorant of the work of this germinal mind.

DEAN C. BARNLUND,
Northwestern University

LANGUAGE, MEANING AND REALITY: A STUDY OF SYMBOLISM. By F. F. Nesbit. New York: Exposition Press, 1955; pp. 181. $3.00.

This book is a clear, though not necessarily accurate, treatment of the problem of meaning. Two of the author's basic premises are that the real world exists independently of any human mind, and that the mind as a function of the brain can interpret and, at least partially, control the world around it. His chief purposes are to consider dreams, myths, and other human behavior from the standpoint of anthropology and psychology; and symbolization, meaning, and reality from the standpoint of history and philosophy. Such a fourfold attack upon meaning would require that one be a specialist in all four of these areas—something which the author does not pretend to be.

Semantics, being the science of meaning, receives his closest attention, and his discussion is distinguished by a careful regard for logic and philology which is frequently absent in popular works in this area. Heeding the ancient warning that one must first define one's terms, the author sets about defining the meaning of definition. He explains the limitations of dictionary definitions, and shows how entire writings must be understood in order adequately to define the ideas of thinkers such as Plato or Darwin. He sets forth some definitions of his own of Taoism, *Logos*, democracy, capitalism, socialism, communism, and imperialism.

The greatest weakness of the book is the author's acceptance of Freud's notions of psychology, and Toynbee's of history. Both Freud and Toynbee assume that human nature is basically irrational, indulge in vague definitions and rigid categorizing, and share dualistic conceptions of the universe: conscious and subconscious, good and evil, pleasure and pain, Yin and Yang, etc. The most noticeable omission is that of Ludwig Wittgenstein, who can hardly be left out of a serious discussion of meaning.

The author's acceptance of Toynbee leads to the repetition of questionable notions of "creative minorities," "fossil remnants," and "living civilizations." The "fossil remnants" include the Jews in America and Europe, and the "primitive peoples" of Africa, Asia and South America. That Emma Lazarus and Einstein can be understood as members of a "fossil remnant" is an error only surpassed by the greater one of underestimating the colonial

peoples who are at present struggling against some real "fossil remnants" of foreign rule and exploitation.

The book contains a defense against those who would try to replace the principle of determinism in science with Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty and thus replace facts with miracles, and science with theology. The author's case would have been strengthened by citing Max Planck's defense of causality against what he called the "indeterminists" in his *Scientific Autobiography* (1949).

Amidst the fallacies and shibboleths current in the "free world" today, this work should help teachers discharge their primary obligation: the liberation of students' minds from the "conventional absolutes" of custom and prejudice.

ROBERT ALBRIGHT,
North Dakota Agricultural College

DISCUSSION. By William S. Howell and Donald K. Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956; pp. 292. $4.00.

The stated aim of the book is to combine critical thinking and sound human relations in such a manner as to produce efficient discussion.

Heavy emphasis is placed on critical thinking techniques because the authors assert that students have traditionally had no access to a complete logical system of problem-solving. A three-stage logical system is outlined and developed, stressing inductive analysis of evidence, generalization, and deductive application of generalizations. The discussion of inductive-deductive techniques is impressively detailed and well illustrated. Indicative of the thoroughness of the treatment is the inclusion of instructions for computing standard deviation, deriving a normal curve, and calculating coefficients of correlation. Symbolic systems are provided for expressing deductive relationships. By contrast the section on generalization is disappointingly brief, filling only five pages.

The human relations aspect of discussion is not considered separately in the book, on the grounds that persons thinking critically together will develop the personal discipline necessary to genuine co-operative behavior. The chapter on interpersonal relations and portions of the chapters on participation and leadership, however, may be considered a specific treatment of how discussants interact.

Material on description and evaluation suggests some new evaluative techniques and includes sample charts for recording various judgments about discussion. Other chapters are concerned with preparation, language, and forms of discussion. *New Yorker* cartoons are strategically placed through the book. The concluding chapter, on the ethics of discussion, is a perceptive catalogue of techniques of manipulating and sabotaging discussion. An appendix includes a thirty-day lesson plan for a course in discussion.

This book offers no tricks or shortcuts to effective discussion. It will find limited application in industrial short courses and other short-range training programs. It appears to be designed for an intensive upper-division college course in discussion. The excellent treatment of logic should give it wide use as a reference book in the teaching of argumentation.

In the opinion of this reviewer the work suffers chiefly from a failure to make the section on logical techniques specifically applicable to the process of discussion. Though the authors indicate that they intend to apply their system to discussion in some detail, they often lose sight of their aim. Possibly this apparent shortcoming can be remedied by sagacious teaching. In its total effect, however, the book may be considered a significant contribution to discussion theory.

HUBER W. ELLINGSWORTH,
Michigan State University

THE ROAD TO PERSUASION. By William Muehl. New York: Oxford University Press: 1956; pp. x+254. $3.95.

The first two or three chapters of this book leave one with the impression that the road to persuasion is beset with many personality pitfalls and psychological abysses. The treatment of stage fright, for instance, appears to be an excursion into the realm of abnormal psychology. Stage fright, the author declares, is not normal nervousness but an "unnatural reaction that frustrates and disables its victim." Having thus taken the view that stage fright is abnormal, author Muehl is off on a search for the "hidden impulse, fear, or sense of guilt that has taken this means of asserting itself." The hidden impulses uncovered by Muehl are called leadership rejection tendencies and they are said to infect the American personality because of the nation's "dramatic psychology of equalitarian individualism."

Thus, to cure stage fright a program of re-education in leadership is indicated. This program consists of recognizing one's inhibitions and of dwelling on the value and inevitability of leadership. Finally, full recovery of sup-

pressed leadership tendencies is achieved by discovering and plugging up "leaks in the power line" of leadership. These leaks are substitute outlets for the leadership impulse—such things as affecting an elaborate casualness, or developing a strong, silent type of personality, or indulging in the habit of negative criticism of others.

The basic assumption on which this theory and therapy of stage fright rest (i.e., that stage fright is not "natural" nervousness but "unnatural" or abnormal panic) may be questioned by many teachers of Speech. That cases of extreme stage fright exist and that these may be regarded as being sufficiently abnormal to require personality reorganization for their cure cannot be denied. It is doubtful, however, that one should assume that best results in the handling of stage fright in all cases is to be achieved by altering the basic personality orientation of the person involved in order to root out assumed hidden impulses, fears, or guilt feelings. It is more reasonable to assume that many, if not most, cases of stage fright are cases of natural nervousness and are to be got at by more direct and economical means than by a trip around Freud's psychological barn.

Nevertheless, there is a good deal of advantage in exposing oneself to the possibilities of this approach. Its application may be considered limited, but in stubborn cases of admittedly abnormal stage fright its use may be extremely fruitful.

When the author turns from stage fright to the problem of communication in persuasion, he stands on the threshold of light and discovery. Declaring that much of what is thought of traditionally as the problem of persuasion is really a problem of communication, he formulates a number of barriers to communication under the headings "Conformity Tendencies" and "Resistance Tendencies." These are worth reading. One could wish, however, that the horizon were broader and the application to speech more concrete. Particularly disappointing is the formula for dissolving barriers to communication. This formula consists of a *direct approach* in which one forewarns the audience by gently suggesting to them the kind of barriers that should not exist, and an *indirect method* in which the speaker "undertakes to get his listeners into the middle of the problem he wants to discuss without their knowing what has happened." These approaches are elaborated to some extent, but one is left at length with considerable uncertainty about specific means of breaking through the indicated barriers of communication.

In the unit on persuasion the author takes the position that the basis of all persuasion can be summed up in two short sentences: "The listener is shown that something he needs or wants is available or threatened. Then he is offered the means for obtaining or protecting it." Three factors, Muehl believes, are used by the speaker in making contact with the concerns of his hearers—rapport, reason, and evidence. Lest it be surmised that the author is trying to assert the primacy of reasoned discourse in persuasion, we should make clear that reason is thought of as having two purposes: (1) the rationalization of non-rational assumptions and (2) assurance to the audience that the speaker is a personality to inspire confidence. The same sorry concept of argument is implicit in the alleged function of evidence. "Evidence itself will not persuade," writes the author. "But the *presentation of evidence* is a token of good faith without which few speakers can succeed."

Again, one may question the wisdom of this view and the likelihood that the application of it will produce the best results in practice. Reason and evidence, many people feel, play in persuasion a role somewhat more explicit and important than they can play if regarded merely "as attributes of the speaker's total personality."

More or less traditional treatments of such topics as organization, preparation, and delivery comprise most of the remainder of this book. Two short chapters, one on radio-television speech and the other on conducting a meeting have been added to the general treatment. The whole is written in a popularized, anecdotal style.

The Road to Persuasion is worth reading. With its faults (or what appear to be faults to this reviewer), it still represents a thoughtful attempt to interpret and understand audience-speaker behavior in new ways. Such a venture is always productive of criticism from those whose views are the reflection of older and different doctrine. But often new ideas spring from new perspectives, and no doubt, *The Road to Persuasion* will stimulate the thinking of many persons in productive, if unaccustomed, channels.

WAYNE C. MINNICK,
Northwestern University

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE OF PREACHING. By Ilion T. Jones. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956; pp. 272. $3.75.

Ilion T. Jones is professor of practical theology at San Francisco Theological Seminary. He has served as the pastor of Presbyterian churches in Texas and Iowa. The author of several books, Dr. Jones has been a frequent contributor to religious periodicals.

Dr. Jones believes that preaching has a divine commission and that God has ordained preaching to accomplish certain results that can be attained in no other way. He maintains that the sermon is the unique method for leading people to believe that God is, that he knows and cares for them. It is his conviction that preaching can lead men to understand and to experience the meaning of fellowship with God.

After consideration of the background of preaching, its importance, its purposes, and the preacher's part in preaching, Dr. Jones turns to the planning of the sermon. He discusses the initial steps, the general principles and procedures of outlining and the types of outlines. Next, he gives his attention to preparing the sermon. Such subjects as the weekly routine, preparing illustrative material, preparing the introduction and conclusion, and the style of the sermon, are carefully presented. When Dr. Jones focuses on preaching the sermon, he treats methods of delivery and speech mechanism. When he writes of building up a reservoir for preaching, he deals with the accumulating of sermon ideas and planning ahead. He finishes his book with a selected bibliography arranged under appropriate headings and with a reasonably full index.

In writing this book, Dr. Jones meets a long felt need—the need for a homiletics textbook which takes the principles of a good Speech textbook and relates them to preaching. Many of the most important speech principles are clearly and concisely stated by him. For instance, "One of the preacher's heavy responsibilities is the necessity of living to some degree what he preaches, if he expects what he preaches to live"; "An outline should have unity . . . order . . . proportion . . . movement . . . climax"; "That English is good English which communicates well the thought of a given speaker to a given audience"; ". . . speak as naturally to a large group as you would converse with a few friends." Dr. Jones not only states the principles but, in a realistic manner, he tells how to practice them. For example, after declaring that "an outline should have unity," he says, "To attain unity each point should be a subthesis of the main thesis." Well-chosen illustrations help to make the ideas interesting and clear. Some readers might wish that the discussion of style was more complete and other readers may object to the somewhat outdated emphasis upon diaphragmatic breathing. Even so, the fine qualities of this book are much more numerous than its limitations.

Principles and Practice of Preaching seems like one of the best and maybe the best, textbook in homiletics that has been written for a long time. Unlike many books about preaching, this one is not long on inspiration and short on information. It has plenty of both. Here is a most valuable means for improving preaching effectiveness. This book appears sure to take its place as a foremost book in the field.

EDMUND HOLT LINN,
Newton-Andover Theological School

HOW TO PREACH TO PEOPLE'S NEEDS. By Edgar N. Jackson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956; pp. 191. $2.75.

This book is written by a clergyman intimately concerned with the use of the sermon as a therapeutic tool in ministering to the emotional needs of congregants. Using the Bible as his authority and the ministry of Jesus as his example, the author suggests that the new understanding of personality structure and human behavior developed in our day should be utilized as an instrument of healing by the preacher.

Preaching to meet people's needs, points out Mr. Jackson, requires, first, an understanding of the nature of personality; second, the ability to visualize and analyze congregants' needs and problems; and third, the knowledge of how to proceed to meet those needs. To meet the first requirement, the preacher must be willing to submit to a searching self-analysis and to steep himself in those resources which will help him gain further insight into the nature of personality. Excellent bibliographies are included for both introductory and intensive study in this area. The second requirement involves effective audience analysis to determine the nature, the extent, and the intensity of needs and problems. The major portion of the text is devoted to the problem of the third requirement—how to preach to meet needs.

Even more important than knowing what to say, is the knowledge of what the preacher should refrain from saying. "A sermon," says

Mr. Jackson, "may be a soul-injuring instrument as well as a soul-healing force. A sermon may set false goals, stimulate unhealthy resentments, promise a security that is unreal, encourage a submissiveness, on the one hand, or aggressiveness, on the other, that could easily lead to more acute personal difficulties. To be a soul-healing influence, a sermon should face the reality of life honestly, proceed creatively toward goals that are reasonable and challenging to the best in life. It should always present a way of living life at its best that is both comprehensible and attainable."

A chapter each is devoted to the problems of guilt, sorrow, fear, alcoholism, insecurity, loneliness, defeat, anger, doubt, tension, confinement, inferiority feelings, injurious habits, old age, immaturity, and family relations. Each problem is analyzed in terms of its significance, implications, and dangers. From the analysis of the nature of each problem comes the suggestions for meeting it. Three or four specific samples or kinds of approaches are made for each problem by the inclusion of sermon résumés.

In this book, Mr. Jackson combines his practical experiences as a minister with his knowledge of psychotherapy to produce a positive and sound approach to the problem of making preaching vital and real. Although the book is not a profound study of personality, it is a very practical approach. It is written in a concise, clear style. Every minister and teacher who is interested in preaching that is psychologically sound, creative, and vital should read it.

LOWELL G. MCCOY,
Hebrew Union College

BILLY GRAHAM: A MISSION ACCOMPLISHED. By George Burnham. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1955; pp. 158. $2.00.

In many respects the mission of Billy Graham differed from that of his evangelistic forbear, Dwight L. Moody. The "best-dressed" appearance of tall, fair, and handsome Graham was in striking contrast to the unkempt, wrinkled black suits with tails struggling to contain a pudgy frame beneath a black beard. Graham preached in a steady stream of machine gun staccato; Moody varied his voice markedly, reaching his prime in the soft, gripping tenor used to illustrate a deathbed scene preparatory to an invitation. Graham kept careful count of his audiences, and, more important, his converts; Moody left all counting up to inquisitive reporters, relying on his God to keep an accurate tally. Graham arrived in the British Isles a seasoned veteran of some five years of big city campaigns in the United States; Moody was scarcely known outside Chicago in 1873. Graham followed in the wake of a vanguard of promotion experts; Moody arrived with even the couple who had invited him since deceased. Graham found a Britain somewhat removed from the top of the totem pole, anxious to keep on good terms with the wealthy leader of the western nations; Moody, on the other hand, encountered a Britain who ruled the seven seas uncontested, and further, a Britain who had fallen on the outs with the Yankee North by her finagling with the agricultural South during the Civil War. From the standpoint of differences then, Graham seems to have enjoyed the advantage.

But perhaps more significant than the differences are the striking similarities. Both Graham and Moody grew up as poor farm boys on the East coast. Both were comparatively uneducated professionally for their day—Graham with no seminary training and Moody with neither high school nor graduate training. Both were in their thirties when they launched their attacks on the British Isles. Both landed in Britain with the odds against them—Graham's incurred by an unfortunate remark concerning Britain's socialism and Moody's by the death of those who had invited him. Both represented the staunchly fundamental, theological right wing which expressed itself in the "simple, old-fashioned gospel of salvation by faith in the atoning blood of Jesus Christ." Both doused the sleepy clerics of staid England with the cold water of practical Christian living. Both were astute as well as discreet in their manner of living, especially regarding finances. Measured by the audiences, converts, and press, radio, and TV coverage, both enjoyed the well-wishes of millions as they left Britain's shores. And perhaps most important, while the press pointed to the sincerity and friendliness of both as the determining factors in their phenomenal success, both, in turn, attributed it to their God, their Bible, and their fellow Christians in prayer.

More than fifty biographers kept close tab on Moody's accomplishments, presenting them, together with his messages, to a hungry public. Scarcely a handful of reporters have come out as yet with books on Graham. Among these, George Burnham's promises to be widely read. As a series of glimpses through a picket fence, *Billy Graham: A Mission Accomplished* reveals

to the passerby not only individual sojourns of an intimate nature in England as well as on the Continent, but even more, a panorama of a campaign as vast as any undertaking of a religious leader since Moody. Burnham, not unknown among American journalists, is perhaps best introduced by Billy Graham himself: "By far the greatest contribution made by any single reporter was that of George Burnham of the Chattanooga *News-Free Press*. Mr. Burnham was with us during the entire tour of 1955 and reported for more than 300 daily newspapers in the United States."

RICHARD K. CURTIS,
Bethel College, St. Paul

BRIEFLY NOTED

ORAL READING. By Lionel Crocker and Louis M. Eich. (Second edition). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; pp. v+492. $5.75.

This edition of *Oral Reading* is a revision and extension of the original text, but strengthened and given sharper focus by the inclusion of three new chapters. In addition, certain sections have been rewritten, contemporary selections have been added to the anthology, the list of references has been enlarged, and class projects have been inserted. The result is a pedagogically sound book, eclectic in approach, practical without being "elocutionary," and critical without centering exclusively on the study of literature. Oral interpretation is recognized as a co-operative enterprise which entails both knowledge of meaning and skill in oral communication.

Among the new chapters, "Some Aesthetic Considerations," which deals with philosophies and factors of literary composition, is outstanding. The central philosophy for the chapter, actually the authors' rationale for the entire book, is that ". . . a liberally educated person not only knows the techniques of communicating his native tongue, but he also knows the theories that underlie those techniques." This section coupled with the chapter on "The Tools of Understanding and Appreciation" furnishes the student with a valid theoretical approach to the analysis of his materials. Total comprehension is sought in the repeated dictum that the reader must acquire intellectual and emotional ownership of the author's ideas. The expanded section on "The Reader's Relationships" focuses on an area too often neglected, the relationship of the oral interpreter to his audience: its convictions, its appreciation, and its responsiveness. "Listening to a Selection," a new chapter, follows the fashion which stresses training for listening. While the principles are sound, perhaps it is futile to demand that the audience listen; ultimately the responsibility for communication must rest with the oral interpreter.

The projects at the end of each chapter are a welcome addition, useful and practical, if somewhat ambitious for the time allotted to performance in the average class. The already interesting anthology has been enhanced by the inclusion of selections by such authors as Arthur Miller, Herman Wouk, Eisenhower, Wallace Stevens, Marianne Moore, and Dylan Thomas. The bibliographies of suggested readings give significant source material for the extension of the student's background.

Oral Reading by Lionel Crocker and Louis M. Eich is a better textbook for the revision. The broad, liberal scope and the balanced emphasis on criticism and communication provide a workable, theoretically sound basis for the study of oral interpretation. The stress on *understanding* still is, as it was in the first edition, the cornerstone of the philosophy. The textbook should have even wider use in this new form.

DONALD E. HARGIS,
University of California, Los Angeles

THE ROMAN MIND: STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THOUGHT FROM CICERO TO MARCUS AURELIUS. By Martin L. Clarke. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956; pp. vii+168. $3.75.

Students of rhetoric who recall Professor Clarke's *Rhetoric at Rome* (1953) may be interested in this later volume dealing with the philosophical currents of classical Rome.

After outlining Roman debts to the Greeks, the author uses the speeches of Cicero as a key to the understanding of ideas which were popularly accepted during his lifetime. Cicero, he reasons, could not have been a successful orator unless his speeches appealed to widely-accepted ideas. In this light his oratorical references to religion, patriotism, and political ideals may provide a valuable picture of the motives and ideals which his contemporaries considered worth while.

The author points out, however, that Cicero's speeches are filled with Roman "sentiment and love of tradition," while his philosophical works on the other hand display a Greek spirit of "disinterested inquiry." Professor Clarke concludes from this difference in tone that Greek

philosophy dominated intellectual life, but failed to dominate the everyday life of the Roman Forum. In short, Greek rhetoric and Greek philosophy were not adopted in the same way by the Romans.

The "Ciceronian" dialogue form, as Professor Clarke sees it, developed at least partially out of Cicero's sceptical attitude toward philosophical inquiry. When some of his readers complained that they could not discover what his own views were, he rebuked them for showing unnecessary curiosity, saying that he did not want his authority to stand in the way of their making an impartial decision. This system, derived from the Academy, lost popularity after his death, for the Augustan age demanded definitive answers rather than argument and debate.

Professor Clarke also offers brief discussions of Epicureanism and Stoicism, with an interesting analysis of the career of Cato the Younger. Cicero, he notes, probably did more than the professional philosophers to transmit Stoic doctrines into Christian writings, especially through his *De Natura Deorum*.

As a background study of the period, *The Roman Mind* may serve as a handy supplement to the same author's *Rhetoric at Rome*. The book is not intended as a complete history of Roman thought, and would probably not be detailed enough for beginning students. For the serious student of rhetoric, however, it may provide some provocative insights into the Roman mentality which shaped the oratory and rhetoric of Cicero.

JAMES J. MURPHY,
Stanford University

THE PHILOSOPHY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS FROM HIS PRIVATE NOTEBOOKS. Edited by Harvey G. Townsend. Eugene, Oregon: The University Press, 1955; pp. xii+270. $3.50.

This paper-bound book, edited by the late Harvey Townsend, is the second volume in the series, "University of Oregon Monographs: Studies in Philosophy." It contains Edwards' essays on "The Mind" and "Of Being" (plus four manuscript pages from a related section in "Notes on Natural Science"), and selections from his nine manuscript volumes entitled "Miscellanies." The latter material, which makes up the greater part of the volume, is presented not in the order in which Edwards entered it in his commonplace book, but under twenty-four convenient subject matter headings, such as: Being of God, Free Will, Morality, Sin. Some of the selections included from "Miscellanies" have not been published before. The text of "The Mind" is taken from the edition of Edwards' works by Sereno Dwight (1829-30), who had access to the original manuscript, now lost.

The student of Edwards' speaking, and of colonial oratory in general, will welcome this collection of materials from his notebooks. The sampling is generous and the organization of the selections is helpful. The rhetorical critic will find of special interest the essay on "The Mind," with its discussion of truth, reasoning, logic, definition, memory, words, and related subjects. As Townsend notes, ". . . 'The Mind' is . . . indispensable in the interpretation of Edwards' philosophy." Intriguing is the item under "Subjects to be handled in the treatise on the mind," which reads: "Why it is proper for orators and preachers to move the passions —needful to show earnestness, etc.; how this tends to convince the judgment, and many other ways is good and absolutely necessary."

In the *Introduction* the editor discusses briefly the major influences in the formation of the philosophy of Edwards.

ORVILLE HITCHCOCK,
State University of Iowa

THOMAS CRANMER, THEOLOGIAN. By G. W. Bromiley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xxviii+108. $3.25.

The author, a former teacher and lecturer, is now rector of St. Thomas' English Episcopal Church, Edinburgh. He is a recognized authority on the Reformation and its key figures, especially Thomas Cranmer.

Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury under Henry VIII, was a leader in the formation of the Church of England. It was he who suggested the procedure by which Henry VIII secured his divorce from Catherine of Aragon; and thus he gained the Archbishopric at the fall of Thomas Wolsey. This volume is published to commemorate the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Cranmer.

Dr. Bromiley's volume is not a biography but a presentation of the major theological concepts of Cranmer, as treated in his various published works. After an introduction presenting Cranmer as a reformer and a first chapter on his scholarship, Bromiley considers in turn his theological views on Scripture and Tradition, Justification, The Church and Ministry, Holy Baptism, The Eucharistic Presence, and The Eucharistic Work. He completes the volume with a brief chapter of summary and estimate

of the place of Cranmer, concluding that Cranmer was a capable and well-read theologian whose main strength lay in scholarship rather than in creative theology. While he was one who had greatness thrust upon him, later lost favor, and in 1556 died at the stake, he made a major contribution to the formulation of the doctrinal standards of the Church of England.

This is a brief, scholarly volume which tells the reader fully as much about the author as it does about the subject. It is primarily, almost solely, a treatise on systematic theology, and relates to the field of Speech only in terms of *inventio*. Bromiley at the outset recognizes that the theological thought of Cranmer cannot be expected to fit into the mold of current doctrine, yet he proceeds at numerous points to evaluate it in that light and often judges it to be right or wrong—from his own point of view. The book would be of interest to the student of theology, but would probably prove dull and of limited value to the casual reader.

WILLIAM H. BOS,
Eastern Michigan College

BOOKS RECEIVED

CONCEPTUAL THINKING. By Stephen Korner. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1955; pp. vii+301. $5.50.

LANGUAGE AND INFORMAL LOGIC. By Robert T. Harris and James L. Jarett. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, Inc., 1956; pp. viii+274. $3.50.

LOGIC AND SCIENTIFIC METHODS. By Herbert L. Searles. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1956; pp. vii+378. $4.25.

ADVERTISING COPY AND COMMUNICATION. By S. Watson Dunn. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956; pp. ix+545. $7.00.

HOW TO DEVELOP BETTER LEADERS. By Malcolm and Hulda Knowles. New York: Association Press, 1955; pp. 64. $1.00.

THE MIGHTY FORCE OF RESEARCH. By the Editors of *Fortune*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956; pp. viii+308. $4.00.

TRAINING THE BACKWARD CHILD. By Herta Loewy. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1956; pp. vii+166. $3.75.

LANGUAGE IN RELATION TO A UNIFIED THEORY OF THE STRUCTURE OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR. Part I. Preliminary Edition. By Kenneth L. Pike. Glendale, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954; pp. 170. $5.00.

DICTIONARY OF EARLY ENGLISH. Edited by Joseph T. Shipley. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1955; pp. xii+753. $10.00.

PRACTICAL AMERICAN ENGLISH. Book One. By Herbert Schueler and Harold Lenz. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956; pp. v+261. $3.25.

SOCIETY. By Robert Ezra Park. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955; pp. 358. $5.00.

DEVELOPING YOUR EXECUTIVE SKILLS. By Auren Uris. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955; pp. x+270. $4.50.

SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

THE BICENTENNIAL of the birthday of Alexander Hamilton is soon upon us. January 11, 1957, is the date formally agreed upon by scholars and statute; and the year is to be observed by the sort of activity that he would most have appreciated himself: good speechmaking. Plans for national competitions for the Alexander Hamilton Commemorative Scholarships have been announced by Bower Aly, University of Missouri, chairman of the Advisory Committee on Contests and Awards of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The plans, now nearing completion, provide that each state or territorial organization select an outstanding student to represent it in the American Students' Constitutional Convention, to be held in Washington or Philadelphia, during June, 1957. The student is to be that one whose public speaking, discussion, and debate most nearly exemplify the reasoned eloquence of Hamilton at his best. He should have made a careful study of the Constitution, so that he will be able to participate effectively in the Convention. Notable national leaders have already given their assurance that they will attend as judges and observers.

Professor Aly has commented that if each of the fifty-five American commonwealths sends a delegate, the Students' Convention will have exactly the same number of delegates as did the Convention of which Hamilton was a member in the summer of 1787. In other respects the Conventions will be somewhat different. In 1787 among those present were George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and Hamilton, whereas in 1957 the delegates will be high school students. In 1787 the delegates came from the colonies along the Atlantic seaboard; in 1957 they will come from the forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Panama Canal Zone.

FROM THE UNITED STATES Information Agency comes an important announcement about the need of that office for well-qualified candidates for positions as Public Affairs Officers, Cultural Affairs Officers, Information Officers, and Binational Center Officers: in short, men who have had training in writing and speaking, with radio, press, or motion picture experience, to direct public affairs programs abroad.

The request comes over the signature of Dr. Argus Tresidder, well known to readers of this department for his book, *Reading to Others,* and for articles in this and other Journals; and it seems to suggest that some of our people trained in speech and drama and other forms of public communication might do the USA and themselves a real service by making application for an overseas appointment. Executive experience, study and travel abroad, knowledge of the culture of a particular area, and ability to speak a foreign language are other important assets. Experience in teaching English as a second language is also useful.

The age limits are 31 to 55; the salary

range is from $5,700 to $10,000, plus allowances; candidates must be willing to serve anywhere in the world. Those interested should write Dr. Tresidder, Cultural Affairs Adviser, Room 652 Walker-Johnson Building, U. S. Information Agency, Washington 25, D. C.

DURING OCTOBER, the Speech Association of America was represented, through the office of the Executive Vice-President, Kenneth Hance, at two important educational conferences—the annual meeting of the American Council on Education (of which the SAA is a Constituent Member) and the Twenty-First Educational Conference sponsored by the Educational Records Bureau and the American Council on Education.

At the former, SAA was represented by the Executive Vice-President. Held in Chicago, this meeting was devoted primarily to a study of the relations of higher education "to the society which it serves." Opening addresses were presented by President David D. Henry, University of Illinois, and Roy E. Larsen, president of Time, Inc.; and other addresses were presented by Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by Henry T. Heald, President of the Ford Foundation. Sectional meetings were devoted to the following topics: Higher Education and Industry; Higher Education and Labor; Higher Education and Agriculture; Higher Education and the Local Community; Higher Education and the States; and Higher Education and the Federal Government. The American Council on Education will soon issue a special publication, "Higher Education and the Society It Serves," which will include the opening addresses and a number of papers presented at the section meetings; in addition, the *Educational Record* will publish a number of documents pertaining to this meeting.

At the latter, held in New York, the Speech Association of America was represented by President Lester Thonssen and by Wayne Nicholas, both of the College of the City of New York.

THE SPEECH DEPARTMENT at Auburn has had good response from its "Mr. Speaker" show over the Alabama Educational Television network. "Mr. Speaker" is a thirty-minute, twelve-week program on Tuesday and Thursday nights, composed primarily of lectures on public address with demonstrations. Although the audience is composed largely of individual viewers, some adult educational groups are following the program. During the winter quarter a program on Group Speech Activities will be presented by William S. Smith. A Speech and Hearing Clinic series, directed by Dr. D. A. Harrington, is under consideration for the spring quarter.

THE TWELFTH ANNUAL Summer Residential Center was held on the Urbana campus of the University of Illinois, June 24—August 3. Sponsored by the State Division of Services for Crippled Children, the University of Illinois summer session, and the Department of Speech, the program of speech and hearing therapy, testing, evaluating, and measuring was attended by thirty-two children. L. W. Olson was coordinator.

BRIEF OFFICIAL BULLETINS: A special Nominating Committee, composed of William S. Howell, N. Edd Miller, and chairman Carroll C. Arnold, will report the name of J. Jeffery Auer, of the University of Virginia, for the office of Executive Vice-President, at the Chicago convention. . . . Add to the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* staff, published in the September Shop Talk, the names of William Utterback and Barnet Baskerville.

MORE THAN 200 DELEGATES attended the fourth annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Theatre Conference at the University of Denver October 26 and 27. Officers for the coming year are Harold Todd, Idaho State College, president; Homer Grout, Colorado Woman's College, vice-president and treasurer. Board members are as follows: Joseph Catmull, University of Utah; Jess Gern, Western State College; Donald Alder, Salt Lake City; Donald Brooks, Grand Junction High School; Alex Murphree, Denver *Post;* Albert Mitchell, Brigham Young University; Homer Paris, Colorado Springs High School; Harold Hansen, Brigham Young University.

THE TEXAS EDUCATIONAL Theatre Association met in special session during the October convention of the Southwest Theatre Conference at the University of Texas. The newly elected president of the Association is Gerald McDonough, head of the Amarillo College Department of Speech and Drama. He succeeds A. E. Johnson of Texas College of Arts and Industries. The Association will hold its 1957 meeting at Sul Ross College, February 15-16. Katharine Boyd, chairman of Sul Ross theatre department, and her staff, will serve as hosts.

THE BROOKLYN COMMUNITY Children's Theatre, project of the Division of Community Service,

Brooklyn College, will open its seventh season on November 24 with two productions by the Department of Speech and Theatre. Professor Elizabeth Casey will direct *Puss In Boots;* Miss Bonnie Hawthorne, *The Happy Prince.* The season will offer seven Saturday matinees including *The Magic Salt Shaker, The Magic Fish, Jack And the Beanstalk, I Wish I Were, Happy The Humbug,* and *Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch.* The Children's Theatre is under the supervision of Jennie Heiden and Melvin R. White.

LENORE EVANS and Wayne Thompson, both of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, are conducting the fifth annual National Contest in Public Discussion. The topic is the national question concerning American policy in the Middle East, and any university, college, or junior college can participate. Programs consist of 25-minute tape recordings, and the deadline each year is December 1. The 1956 contest was won by the University of Virginia. Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire was second, and Idaho State College was third.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH at the University of Michigan is working out an interesting curricular development in the integration, on the elementary course level, of dramatic instruction for the areas of theatre, radio, and television. Last year courses in scene design and stagecraft, theretofore concerned primarily with theatre, were revised to include television as well. The current semester witnessed the introduction of a beginning course in acting for theatre, radio, and television.

NEW PHYSICAL FACILITIES are under construction for Purdue University's Department of Speech. A new theatre building to be known as Loeb Auditorium is scheduled for completion by September 1958. The auditorium will include the Loeb Theatre with a seating capacity of 1100 and the Experimental Theatre which will seat 225. The building will also have space for simultaneous rehearsals of five different shows, two star dressing rooms, two chorus dressing rooms, showers, locker rooms, a kitchenette, and a green room. Lighting controls for the theatres will combine the advantages of pre-set with master operation. An integral part of the building is a large scene shop which will be equipped with facilities for the use of power equipment.

Another new building, to be known as Heavilon Hall, will house Purdue's Speech offices, classrooms, clinic, and laboratories. In addition to enlarged quarters for the speech correction clinic and laboratories, the structure will have fifty-six classrooms including rooms designed for instruction in group discussion and facilities for development of listening skills. Office space will be provided for administrative personnel, forensic activities, adult education in business and industrial speech, and the Speech faculty. The entire structure, to be air-conditioned throughout, consists of two office floors, three classroom floors, and a basement which will house the speech correction facilities.

THE CHICAGO UNDERGRADUATE Division, University of Illinois, received a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, national honorary in forensics, last May. Lloyd Dudley, formerly a professor at Illinois College, officiated at the installation in his capacity as Governor of the Province of Illinois. Clarence Nystrom, Wheaton College, assisted in the ceremonies. Twenty-four UIC students and alumni were initiated along with Dean Charles Caveny, the first honorary member.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS *Reader's Theatre* was active during the summer and started its second year of operation with a presentation of Shaw's *Androcles and the Lion* as part of a University-wide observance of the anniversary of Shaw's death. During the past summer, interpretation students also did a series of radio programs over WILL as part of the *Library Presents* program. Oral interpreters under the direction of Martin Cobin will soon launch an experiment in educational television on WILL-TV in getting underway a series entitled "Pick a Poet."

WE ASKED OUR COLLEAGUE, Bower Aly, if he had any news for Shop Talk. He lifted his head from a stack of manuscripts and said that Aaron Burr had just shot Alexander Hamilton. "Hamilton is not expected to live, Burr is in hiding, and the city is in turmoil," he continued. "I will let you know how it turns out as soon as I have further information." Well, as a quarterly is too slow for these flash items, we are going to be scooped on the story, and, of all things, by a book—*Alexander Hamilton: Selections Representing His Life, His Thought, and His Style,* scheduled for publication January 11, Hamilton's birthday.

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION has just granted a license to the University of Virginia for a low-power FM station. To be known as WTJU (Thomas Jefferson's University), the station will begin a regular schedule of broadcasts in the fall. George P. Wilson, Jr., associ-

ate professor of speech, and member of the editorial board of the *Southern Speech Journal*, will serve as director of the station.

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Speech Association of America, American Forensic Association, National Society for the Study of Communication, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 27-29, 1956. Some committee, council, and legislative assembly meetings on December 26. American Educational Theatre Association, same place, Dec. 28-30. Some council and committee meetings on Dec. 27.

Central States Speech Association: Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, April 5-6, 1957; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, December 27-28, 1957.

Southern Speech Association: University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Athens, April 1-5.

Other conventions for the Speech Association of America are now scheluded as follows:

1957: Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28. (With AETA.)

1958: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 29-31.

1959: Hotel Statler, Washington, December 28-30.

1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.

IRA MORRISON, head of the Department of Speech at Phillips University, announces a new program leading to certification in speech and hearing therapy. A new Speech and Hearing Clinic has just been completed on the campus, and members of the clinic staff will teach the courses at Phillips. The clinic has six therapy rooms, all equipped with one-way observation mirrors, a two-room hearing evaluation set-up, offices and waiting room. As a result of a recent federal grant from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the new clinic is equipped with more than $19,000 worth of professional and technical equipment. Thayne A. Hedges is director of the new program, with Henry E. Spuehler as assistant director and audiologist. Mrs. David Tull and Mary Ann Sherley are speech and hearing therapists.

THE SCHOOL OF DRAMATIC ART and Speech at Ohio University has been awarded a grant of $10,000 from the Fund for the Advancement of Learning, to be used to defray the expenses of a preliminary study of ways and means of improving the effectiveness of teaching in certain basic speech courses and the related clinical services. The project will be under the direction of a departmental steering committee consisting of Elizabeth Andersch, Edward Penson, Lawrence Staats, Vincent Jukes, and A. C. LaFollette, under the chairmanship of Claude E. Kantner. Lester Hale, professor of speech at the University of Florida, will join the staff on a one-year appointment to serve as special consultant and give his full time to the study. It is hoped that teaching methods, audio-visual aids, and administrative procedures can be evolved that will be on general interest in the professional field.

SIXTY SPEECH AND HEARING therapists met at Southwest Texas Teachers College, San Marcos, Texas, on September 29, and organized the Texas Speech and Hearing Association. The following officers were elected: president, Jack Bangs, director of Speech and Hearing Center, Houston; vice-president, Elizabeth Bradley, Supervisor of Oral-Deaf Classes, Fort Worth Public Schools, Fort Worth; secretary, Mac Mosley, speech therapist, Gladewater; treasurer, Lennart L. Kopra, Speech and Hearing Clinic, University of Texas.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Brooklyn College: *Peer Gynt, The Dybbuk, Summer and Smoke, Dark of the Moon*, original All-College musical.

Catawba College: *A Streetcar Named Desire, Arsenic and Old Lace, Henry IV* (Part I), *Everyman's Reward.*

Earlham College: *The Male Animal, King Henry IV* (Part I), *The Trojan Woman.*

Iowa State College: *Peter Pan, The Innocents, Ten Nights in a Barroom.*

Lehigh University: *Richard II.*

Louisiana State University: *The Confidential Clerk, Liliom.*

Purdue University: *Stalag 17, The Desperate Hours, Ten Nights in a Barroom, The Rivals,* eight sets of experimentals.

San Jose State College: *Much Ado About Nothing, Shadow and Substance, Laburnum Grove, The Beaux' Stratagem, Green Grow the Lilacs, Nobel Prize.*

University of Kansas: Fraser Theatre: *The Rainmaker, The House of Bernarda Alba, Of Thee I Sing, Thieves' Carnival, Trouble in Tahiti, Gianni Schicchi.* Studio Theatre: *The Inspector General, Darkness at Noon, The Doctor In Spite of Himself.* Children's Theatre: *Marco Polo, Peter Rabbit.*

University of Illinois: Summer, 1956: *The Infernal Machine* and *The Chalk Garden.* Summer Youth Theatre: Scenes from *Antigone, The*

Doctor in Spite of Himself, The Glass Menagerie, and *She Stoops to Conquer.* 1956-57 season: *A Streetcar Named Desire, The Beggar's Opera, Macbeth, A Dream Play,* and *Quadrille.* Workshop Theatre (October program): *The Merry Death, Interior,* and *Box and Cox.*

University of Michigan: Summer: *Anastasia, The Circle, The Wayward Saint, The Lady's Not For Burning, La Boheme.* Fall: *The Devil and Daniel Webster, Billy Budd, Under the Gaslight, Hansel and Gretel, Juno and the Paycock.*

University of Oregon: *Man and Superman, Doctor in Spite of Himself, Desire Under the Elms.*

University of Texas: *Love for Love, The Innocents, Mother Courage, The Birds, Curtain Club Show,* annual Shakespearean production.

University of Virginia: 1956-1957: *Route 27, Red Roses for Me, St. Joan, Uncle Vanya, The Matchmaker.* Summer 1956: *Mesalliance, The Chalk Garden, The Rainmaker.*

University of Wisconsin: *Of Thee I Sing, Hedda Gabler, The Plough and the Stars, Morning's at Seven, Elizabeth the Queen.*

APPOINTMENTS

Brigham Young University: Albert O. Mitchell, Children's and Young People's Theatre.

Hamden, Conn., Public Schools: Barbara Bard, Celeste Hocs, Rose-Marie Landrock, Department of Speech and Hearing Education.

Lehigh University: Eugene Vasilew, assistant professor of speech.

Louisiana State University: Irene Huenefeld, assistant professor of speech; George H. Gunn, assistant professor of speech; C. Wesley Lambert, television producer; Arthur J. Jacobs, program director, WLSU; Andrew Rasbury, assistant technical director.

Michigan State University: Kenneth G. Hance, professor of speech.

Mississippi Southern College: A. Donald George, associate professor of speech and director of forensics.

New York University: Yetta G. Mitchell, acting chairman of the Department of Speech, School of Education.

Ohio State University: George L. Lewis, assistant professor of speech education.

Ohio University: Lloyd Watkins, Richard Ham, assistant professors of speech.

Purdue University: Joseph G. Stockdale, assistant professor of speech; William I. Gorden, D. Arne Hill, James A. Johnson, Charles R. Petrie, Jr., E. Walter Richter, George A. Sanborn, J. Clifton Trimble, instructors in speech; Carl K. White, instructor in speech and assistant technical director in theatre; Helen V. Anderson, Betty Rae Foster, Alyce Rae Keagle, Shirley Sills, graduate clinical assistants; Douglas S. Benbow, Karl W. Held, Lyle E. Lapray, James L. Roberts, Ellis J. Santone, Henry Z. Scheele, Herbert W. Simons, D. Richard Smith, Frances S. Smith, graduate assistants in speech.

San Jose State College: James M. Craig, Dorothy Hadley, assistant professors of speech.

Stephen F. Austin State College: Sally M. Gearhart, director of drama; Edna Sorber, instructor in fundamentals, assistant debate coach.

University of California at Los Angeles: Alfred Larr, Michael D'Asaro.

University of Delaware: Franklin Moody, assistant professor.

University of Illinois: Charles Hutton, assistant professor of speech; Jack Armould, William Beattie, Jerome Birdman, Erwin Bettinghaus, Jane Blankenship, Kenneth Branch, Sheila Brutten, William Carmack, Karl Cavanaugh, Nancy Clarke, Robert Coulson, Lois Craig, Scott Craig, Wade Curry, Charles Davies, Thomas Fay, Elaine Foster, Paul Goldberg, Robert Goldman, Anthony Holbrook, Linda Ishmael, Arvin Jackson, Oya Kaynar, Jay Ludwig, Lucille Magnon, James Mayer, Murray Miron, Leslie Rude, Bruce Schneider, Joan Smith, Joyce Sozen, Robert Spell, Hermann Stelzner, Sara Stelzner, David Strother, Preston Tuttle, and Doyle Ward, graduate teaching assistants; Leticia Nietes and Stephen Quigley, graduate fellows.

University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division: Theodore Kundrat, instructor in voice and diction, part time.

University of Kansas: Arthur Kean, stage lighting; Virgil Godfrey, scene design; Sally Six, Children's Theatre; Ruth Bobbish, speech clinic; Durglit Carnalran, speech clinic; Bee Harvey, instructor in speech; Will Linkugel, assistant director of debate.

University of Michigan: Louis Lerea, research associate; Gwen Adams, psychiatric social worker; Hsi-Yen Liu, instructor in pediatrics at the University Hospital, consultant for the clinic; James Brock, visiting professor of speech; Walter Stevens, instructor in speech.

University of Missouri: Neal Balanoff, Thomas L. Fernandez, Robin Humphrey, Chandler Monroe, Joseph O'Rourke, Rudolph Verdeber, Robert Wise, instructors in speech; Dorothy DeLano, John Tindel, graduate assistants in speech; Sanford D. Gray, clinical recorder; Bette Greenberg, student forensic manager; Ron Hunt, Susanne Shutz, student assistants in television production.

University of Texas: Kenneth G. Wilkens, assistant professor; Harry Jones, Mrs. Kit Charles, teaching assistants.

University of Virginia: Carolyne G. Khuri, assistant professor of speech, director of the hearing clinic of the Speech and Hearing Center; Clyde McElroy, Ralph C. Rives, Arthur F. Prosper, part-time instructors in speech.

PROMOTIONS

Purdue University: T. D. Hanley, Ross D. Smith, professors of speech; H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Earl R. Harlan, Frances Patton, associate professors of speech; Keith S. Montgomery, assistant professor of speech; Joseph G. Godwin, William R. Ditton, instructor in speech.

San Jose State College: Ward Rasmus, professor of speech, director of college Speech and Hearing Clinic, assistant head of department; Courtenay Brooks, associate professor of speech.

University of Illinois: Lee S. Hultzén, professor; Raymond E. Nadeau, associate professor; Wayne E. Brockriede, assistant professor.

PERSONALS

J. Jeffery Auer, chairman of the department of Speech and Drama at the University of Virginia, was a visiting professor during the summer session at the University of Michigan. James M. Mullendore, director of the Speech and Hearing Center, served as acting chairman for the summer.

Robert Pierce of the University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch, is the current president of the Minnesota Speech and Hearing Association. . . . Frank Whiting of the University of Minnesota will bring to the Duluth campus, on February 22 and 23, the production *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with Professor Whiting as Bottom. . . . Harold Hayes, director of the theatre at Duluth, will be one of four local directors who will direct plays this season at the Duluth Playhouse. Dr. Hayes's production will be *Romeo and Juliet*.

Horace W. Robinson, director of the University Theatre, is on leave from the University of Oregon for the 1956-57 academic year. He is a visiting professor at the University of California at Los Angeles. LeRoy Hinze of Montana State University is replacing Professor Robinson on the UO staff. . . . Frederick J. Hunter spent the 1956 summer session as a visiting lecturer and director at the University of California at Berkeley. . . . Glenn Starlin spent ten weeks this past summer on a special assignment with the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor. . . . R. D. Clark, former head of the Department of Speech, has recently been appointed as the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Oregon. . . . Kenneth Scott Wood, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic, has returned from sabbatical leave after a year in Norway lecturing under the Fulbright program. Dr. Wood lectured at the Children's Clinic in the State Hospital in Oslo, at the University of Bergen, and the Universities of Uppsala and Stockholm in Sweden. In Oslo he participated in the training courses conducted by the Norwegian government for speech therapists and lectured to physical therapists, medical students, dentists, teachers, and lay groups.

Nadine Shepardson, professor of speech and drama at Mount Holyoke College, is spending a semester's leave of absence in Europe, where she is continuing her research in theatre criticism. . . . The Pennsylvania Speech Association presented its annual award for "Distinction in the Art of Speech Used in the Service of Mankind" to Dean Everett Lee Hunt, Swarthmore College.

Earlham College will present An Old English Elizabethan May Day Pageant on May 17. *Midsummer Night's Dream, Merry Men of the Greenwood, St. George and the Dragon, Revesby Sword Play* are among the dramatic features of this traditional performance. E. Orville Johnson is chairman of the department at Earlham.

D. E. Morley of the Speech Clinic of the University of Michigan is in Oslo for the academic year on a Fulbright lectureship. . . . Professor and Mrs. William Halstead, who conducted a summer European theatre tour, are in residence in London for the current year where they are continuing their study of the contemporary British theatre.

W. Charles Redding of Purdue University was visiting associate professor of speech at the University of Southern California's second summer session. . . . Keith S. Montgomery served as Director of Forensics for the University of Wyoming's three-week high school Speech Institute at Laramie during last summer. Professor Montgomery is the new editor of the Tau Kappa Alpha *Speaker*. . . . Frank E. Funk, who received his doctorate from Purdue University last year, is now an assistant professor of speech at Syracuse University. Another recent Ph.D. from Purdue, Darrell T. Piersol, has been appointed to International Business Machine's Department of Education at Endicott, N. Y. . . . Ross D. Smith served for the fifth successive year as director of the Michiana Sum-

mer Theater in Michigan City, Indiana. The theater's ten-week season included eight plays and one musical production. Ten different schools were represented in the acting and technical company chosen through auditions of students in college and university drama departments. . . . Lowell Matson spent a part of the summer on the drama staff of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Michigan. . . . Carl K. White, new to Purdue University's drama staff this year, was technical director at the Banff School of Fine Arts last summer. . . . James A. Hawley, formerly of Purdue, is now acting technical director for the Drake University theater. . . . M. D. Steer has been appointed consultant to the Muscatatuck State School for the Mentally Retarded at Butlersville, Indiana.

Carl A. Pitt, Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, is preparing for distribution a microcard edition of Goodrich's *Select British Eloquence*. Richard Murphy, University of Illinois, Urbana, has written an introduction to the new edition. The cost for each set of microcards (one volume) will be approximately $3.50. . . . Mrs. Frances Goulson, Director of Pier Playhouse at the Chicago Undergraduate Division, spent last summer in Spain. She spent much of her time working in a movie production. . . . Matthew Rigler, director of the Speech Clinic, is seriously ill and is not teaching during the present semester. Mr. Rigler was hospitalized for a month during the summer and became ill again following the second day of the fall semester.

Lee S. Hultzén of the University of Illinois attended the conference on problems of speech communication at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June 15 and 16. He also read a paper on Free Allophones at the summer meeting of the Linguistic Society of America at Ann Arbor, Michigan, in July. . . . Barnard Hewitt has returned to the Urbana campus after a sabbatical semester and a summer spent largely in New York City working on the early history of the American theatre. . . . Karl Wallace addressed the Oklahoma Speech Association on October 25 on the topic, "More Than We Can Teach." He will be on leave of absence from the University from February to September, 1957, investigating what the Elizabethans understood about the "faculties" of the mind. He will study at the University of Illinois, and at the Folger, Congressional, and Huntington Libraries. . . . Halbert Gulley has been appointed Director, University of Illinois Citizens Committee, a state-wide group of prominent Illinois citizens who advise the President of the University on matters of policy affecting the public interest. He was also appointed Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Student Affairs. . . . Clara Behringer and Genevieve Richardson have returned to the Urbana campus after spending several weeks in Europe on a tour of "sights and scenes important in theatre history." . . . Leticia Nietes is attending the University of Illinois on a University of Illinois fellowship and a Fulbright travel grant. She was one of 34 Fulbright travel grantees chosen out of 500 applicants. She is from Manila, Philippines, and is on leave of absence from the University of Santo Tomas, Manila, where she teaches English and social science.

Eugene C. Chenoweth, Indiana University, was on sabbatical leave the first semester last year and spent four months in the British Isles doing research on discussion and debate in Great Britain. He visited universities in England, Scotland, and Ireland, observing the debating societies in action at Trinity College, Dublin University, and the Universities of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Birmingham, London, Cambridge, and Oxford. He saw the first appearance of a coed debater on the floor of the Men's Cambridge Union and the first women's debate at that university. During January he was in Europe, traveling as far as Athens, Greece, in his study of ancient and modern forums.

Ormond Drake, formerly Chairman of the Department of Speech of the University College of New York University, later Assistant Dean and subsequently Director of Public Occasions and Assistant Secretary for the University, has been granted a leave of absence to serve as Director of The Town Hall, Inc., New York City.

During the summer, Jesse Villarreal, director of the Speech Clinic at the University of Texas, directed a research project supported by the Hogg Foundation and aimed at the development of a profile of language development for use with children with delayed speech. Particular attention was given to the measurement of the sound system and of intelligibility. Preliminary forms of the profile have been used in Hogg Foundation projects in speech therapy at Southwest Texas State Teachers College and Texas Christian University. Dr. Villarreal also served as consultant in speech pathology to the Division of Maternal and Child Health of the State Health Department where he assisted Ernest Rolston in preliminary planning for a proposed program of assistance for children with repaired cleft palates and for families of pre-

school children with hearing difficulties. . . . Maurine Amis, instructor in speech correction, spent part of the summer travelling under a grant from the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health to universities throughout the North and East. Some of the universities that she visited are as follows: University of Michigan, Wayne University, Western Michigan College, Columbia University, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada. . . . Howard W. Townsend served as consultant and instructor for the annual Distributive Education Conference and Institute held at the Hilton Hotel, San Antonio, during the first ten days of August. . . . Don Williams, Director of Forensics and instructor of Radio-TV classes, worked with Austin's local radio-TV station KTBC-TV.

Giles W. Gray, professor of speech at Louisiana State University, is taking a sabbatical leave during the first semester. . . . Edith Dabney, retired associate professor of speech, is now living in Jefferson City, Mo. . . . During the summer Don F. Blakely, technical director, served as co-director of the Michiana Summer Theatre for the fourth year. . . . Jean Starr Wiksell is directing the Baton Rouge Children's Theatre for the ninth year. The first production will be *The Clown Who Ran Away*. Mrs. Wiksell is serving for the nineteenth year as the consultant on puppetry for the Junior Leagues of America.

Melvin R. White of Brooklyn College lectured in Central America last summer on "Theatre, U. S. A." His tour opened in San Salvador on July 3 at the Centro El Salvador-Estados Unidos, and continued in Guatemala, and Mexico; thence back to the States in Kansas, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Jacobus tenBroek, professor of speech and departmental chairman at the University of California, Berkeley, has been awarded an honorary Litt.D. degree. The degree, honoring Professor tenBroek for his numerous welfare activities and scholarly works, was presented at convocation ceremonies at Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio. . . . Gerald E. Marsh, associate dean of Letters and Science and since 1954 director of summer sessions, attended the annual meeting of the Association of Deans and Directors of Summer Sessions, October 19 and 20 at the University of Michigan. . . . An article on the prosody of Marianne Moore's poetry, by Robert Beloof, will appear soon in *The Kenyon Review*. A book of Mr. Beloof's poetry entitled *The One-Eyed Gunner*, published in England, will also soon appear. . . . Woodrow Borah spent the summer of 1956 in Mexico, in company with Sherburne F. Cook of the Department of Physiology of the University of California, on a fellowship of the Associates in Tropical Biogeography. . . . David Rynin has been elected president of the Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association. . . . Don Geiger will spend the spring semester 1957 on sabbatical leave. He has recently published a volume of poetry, *Unexpected Truce*. . . . Richard Hagopian, whose novel *Wine for the Living* appeared last spring, has just had an earlier novel *Faraway The Spring* accepted by an Italian publisher for translation in an edition of 50,000 copies. . . . Allan Temko is the author of *Notre Dame of Paris*, which recently received a Gold Medal Award of the Commonwealth Club for the best work in non-fiction published in 1955 by a Californian. . . . Floyd W. Matson, lecturer in speech, returned to the Berkeley campus this September from a year's leave of absence in Japan as resident administrator of the University of California's Far East Program.

Richard Murphy of the University of Illinois becomes the new editor of Shop Talk beginning with the next issue. Contributions for the February issue should therefore be mailed to him. We hope our readers will help him launch his first issues by sending him a sturdy supply of news items, typed double-spaced in the traditional MS. style, one item to a page. The outgoing editor wishes to thank his gallant company of scouts for their continued interest and support, and hopes that each and every one sends regular dispatches to Editor Murphy.

Just as this issue of *QJS* was going to press, Shop Talk received word that James A. Winans had died on November 20. He was a founder of the Speech Association of America and served as its second president in 1916. He was the author of *Public Speaking* and of its revision, *Speech-Making*, widely-used texts for more than thirty years. Only this fall Artcraft Press brought out *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder*, the subject of the leading review in the present issue of the *QJS*. Professor Winans was for many years identified with the departments of speech at Cornell and at Dartmouth. After his formal retirement he taught at the University of Missouri for the period September 1, 1942, to April 30, 1945. We remember him at Missouri with great affection: he genuinely liked to talk shop, to share his ideas, and to listen to those of others. A considered tribute to Professor Winans will appear in a later issue of this Journal.

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

INDEX TO VOLUME XLII

Abel, James W. English in Greece. 263.

Adams, Richard G. Rev.: *Child Drama.* Peter Slade. 203.

Akin, Johnnye, Seth Fessenden, P. Merville Larson, and Albert N. Williams. *Helping the Bible Speak.* Rev. by Harold C. Svanoe. 320.

——— Rev.: *Choral Speaking is Fun.* Letitia Raubicheck. 99.

——— Rev.: *Holiday Book for Verse Choirs.* Gertrude Dixon Enfield. 99.

Albright, Robert. Rev.: *Language, Meaning and Reality: A Study of Symbolism.* F. F. Nesbit. 434.

Allen, Harold B. Rev.: *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English.* Henry Lee Smith, Jr. 326.

——— Rev.: *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies,* ed. S. C. Aston. 97.

Aly, Bower. Rev.: *American Public Addresses: 1740-1952,* ed. A. Craig Baird. 416.

American Council on Education. *Credit Courses by Television.* Rev. by Garrett L. Starmer. 208.

Amster, Walter W., Louis M. Di Carlo, and Gilbert R. Herer. *Speech After Laryngectomy.* Rev. by Lester L. Hale. 431.

Angle, Paul M. and Earl Schenck Miers, eds. *The Living Lincoln.* Rev. by Barnet Baskerville. 194.

Arnett, Willard E. *Santayana and the Sense of Beauty.* Rev. by William R. Gondin. 430.

Arnold, Carroll C. and John Keltner. Discussion in American Colleges and Universities. 250.

——— Rev.: *Anthony Eden: The Chronicle of a Career.* Lewis Broad. 308.

——— Rev.: *Eden: The Making of a Statesman.* Alan Campbell-Johnson. 308.

——— Rev.: *Portrait of a Statesman.* Dennis Bardens. 308.

Aston, S. C., ed. *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies.* Rev. by Harold B. Allen. 97.

Atherton, Lewis. *Main Street on the Middle Border.* Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 196.

Atkinson, W. Kirtley and Theodore F. Nelson. *Speech and Your Personality.* Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 90.

Auer, J. Jeffery. The Forum. Increasing and Using the Supply of Teachers of Speech. 295.

Bacon, Wallace A. Rev.: *The Mutual Flame: On Shakespeare's Sonnets and the Phoenix and the Turtle.* G. Wilson Knight. 201.

Bahn, Eugene. Rev.: *Die Gestalt Des Gedichtes, Seine Sprechkundliche Interpretation Und Nachgestaltung.* Marie-Hed Kaulhausen. 431.

Baird, A. Craig, ed. *American Public Addresses: 1740-1952.* Rev. by Bower Aly. 416.

———, ed. *Representative American Speeches: 1954-1955.* Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 309.

Bannerman, Le Roy. Entertain to Educate. 170.

Barbara, Dominick A. *Stuttering: A Psychodynamic Approach to its Understanding and Treatment.* Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 432.

Bardens, Dennis. *Portrait of a Statesman.* Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 308.

Barnlund, Dean C. Rev.: *Group-Centered Leadership.* Thomas Gordon. 93.

——— Rev.: *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf,* ed. John B. Carroll. 433.

Barry, David W., Everett C. Parker and Dallas W. Smythe. *The Television-Radio Audience and Religion.* Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 322.

Baskerville, Barnet. Rev.: *The Living Lincoln,* ed. Paul M. Angle and Earl Schenck Miers. 194.

Beasley, Jane. *Slow to Talk.* Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 432.

Becker, Samuel L. and H. Clay Harshbarger. Teaching by Discussion on Television. 375.

Begley, Martin and Douglas MacCrae. *Auditioning for TV.* Rev. by Eugene S. Foster. 208.

Bellman, Willard F. Aesthetics and Stage Design. 257.

——— Rev.: *Stagecraft for Nonprofessionals.* F. A. Buerki. 205.

Bennett, Daphne Nicholson. Auden's "September 1, 1939": An Interpreter's Analysis. 1.

Bennett, Margaret E. *Guidance in Groups.* Rev. by R. Victor Harnack. 206.

Bettinger, Hoyland. *Television Techniques.* Rev. by Garrett L. Starmer. 211.

Binns, Archie and Olive Kooken. *Mrs. Fiske and the American Theatre.* Rev. by Garff B. Wilson. 310.

Boase, Paul H. Rev.: *The Television-Radio Audience and Religion.* Everett C. Parker, David W. Barry and Dallas W. Smythe. 322.

Bode, Carl. *The American Lyceum: Town Meeting of the Mind.* Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 306.

Bohman, George V. Rev.: *The Birth of the Bill of Rights.* Robert Allen Rutland. 193.

Boomsliter, Paul C. *Stuttering: A Psychodynamic Approach to its Understanding and Treatment.* Dominick A. Barbara. 432.

——— Rev.: *Slow to Talk.* Jane Beasley. 432.

Bos, William H. Rev.: *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian.* G. W. Bromiley. 440.

Bowen, Elbert R. Rev.: *These Were Actors: A Story of the Chapmans and the Drakes.* George D. Ford. 311.

Braden, Waldo W. Rev.: *The American Lyceum: Town Meeting of the Mind.* Carl Bode. 306.

Bradley, Howard A. and James A. Winans. *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder.* Rev. by Frederick W. Haberman. 411.

Broad, Lewis. *Anthony Eden: The Chronicle of a Career.* Rev. by Carroll C Arnold. 308.

Brockriede, Wayne E. Rev.: *Basic Public Speaking.* Paul Soper. 324.

Bromiley, G. W. *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian.* Rev. by William H. Bos. 440.

Brown, J. R., ed. *The Merchant of Venice.* By William Shakespeare. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.
Brown, Spencer F., Wendell Johnson, James F. Curtis, Clarence W. Edney, and Jacqueline Keaster. *Speech Handicapped School Children.* Rev. by Wayne L. Thurman. 325.
Brownell, Clifford Lee, Leo Gans and Tufie Z. Maroon. *Public Relations in Education.* Rev. by Howard Stephenson. 98.
Bruner, Jerome S., M. Brewster Smith, and Robert W. White. *Opinions and Personality.* Rev. by William S. Howell. 318.
Bryant, Donald C. Burke's *Present Discontents:* The Rhetorical Genesis of a Party Testament. 115.
——— Whither the Humanities? 363.
——— Rev.: *A Guide to Parliamentary Papers.* P. and G. Ford. 209.
——— Rev.: *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700.* Wilbur Samuel Howell. 304.
——— Rev.: *Speculative Instruments.* I. A. Richards. 198.
Buerki, F. A. *Stagecraft for Nonprofessionals.* Rev. by Willard F. Bellman. 205.
Burnham, George. *Billy Graham: A Mission Accomplished.* Rev. by Richard K. Curtis. 438.
Burtt, J. O., tr. *Minor Attic Orators, II: Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades, Hyperides.* Rev. by Harry Caplan. 190.
Butler, Katherine G. and Charles Van Riper. *Speech in the Elementary Classroom.* Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 87.

Campbell-Johnson, Alan. *Eden: The Making of a Statesman.* Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 308.
Cannon, Myrtle H. *Your Voice is You.* Rev. by Letitia Raubicheck. 99.
Caplan, Harry. Rev.: *Minor Attic Orators, II: Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades, Hyperides,* tr. J. O. Burtt. 190.
Cardwell, Guy. Rev.: *The Development of American Literary Criticism,* ed. Floyd Stovall. 81.
Carrell, James A., Alice Streng, Waring J. Fitch, Le Roy D. Hedgecock, and James W. Phillips. *Hearing Therapy for Children.* Rev. by Albert Murphy. 88.
Carroll, John B., ed. *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* Rev. by Dean C. Barnlund. 433.
Carter, Elton S. Rev.: *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures.* Robert K. Merton, Marjorie Fiske and Patricia L. Kendall. 321.
Ching, James C. Stanley Baldwin's Speech on the Abdication of Edward VIII. 163.
Clark, Robert D. *The Life of Matthew Simpson.* Rev. by Robert Gray Gunderson. 307.
——— Rev.: *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F. D. R.* Richard Hofstadter. 420.
Clarke, Martin L. *The Roman Mind: Studies in the History of Thought From Cicero to Marcus Aurelius.* Rev. by James J. Murphy. 439.
Cohen, Dorothy, S. S. Stevens and J. G. C. Loring. *Bibliography on Hearing.* Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 98.
Cook, Reginald L. Notes on Frost the Lecturer. 127.
Coon, Horace. *Triumph of the Eggheads.* Rev. by Richard Murphy. 197.
Corrigan, Robert N., ed. *The Carleton Drama Review.* Rev. 212.
Corwin, Blanche, ed. *The Theatre Annual, 1955.* Rev. by Harold V. Gould. 82.
Craig, Hardin. *English Drama of the Middle Ages.* Rev. by Hubert Heffner. 199.
Crocker, Lionel. *Public Speaking for College Students.* Rev. by James N. Holm. 323.
——— and Louis M. Eich. *Oral Reading.* Rev. by Donald E. Hargis. 439.
——— Rev.: *Lectures to My Students.* C. H. Spurgeon. 210.
Croft, Albert J. The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism. 283.
Cromwell, Harvey. *Working for More Effective Speech.* Rev. by Wofford G. Gardner. 95.
Current, Richard N. and J. G. Randall. *Lincoln the President: Last Full Measure.* Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 77.
Curtis, James F., Wendell Johnson, Spencer F. Brown, Clarence W. Edney, and Jacqueline Keaster. *Speech Handicapped School Children.* Rev. by Wayne L. Thurman. 325.
Curtis, Richard K. Rev.: *Billy Graham: A Mission Accomplished.* George Burnham. 438.

Dean, Leonard F., ed. *Nine Great Plays: From Aeschylus to Eliot.* Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 210.
De Armand, Fred. *How to Sell and Unsell Ideas.* Rev. by David C. Phillips. 98.
Dennett, Raymond and Joseph E. Johnson, eds. *Negotiating with the Russians.* Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Di Carlo, Louis M., Walter W. Amster, and Gilbert R. Herer. *Speech after Laryngectomy.* Rev. by Lester L. Hale. 431.
Dickey, D. C., R. T. Oliver, and H. P. Zelko. *Communicative Speech.* Rev. by Arthur Eisenstadt. 96.
Dickey, Dallac C. Rev.: *The South Lives in History: Southern Historians and their Legacy.* Wendell Holmes Stephenson. 193.
Dieter, Otto A. Rev.: *The Humanism of Cicero.* H. A. K. Hunt. 78.
Doll, Ronald, Thomas Pollock, Marion Sheridan and Frances Ledbetter. *The Art of Communicating.* Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 90.
Dooher, M. Joseph and Vivienne Marquis, eds. *Effective Communication.* Rev. by Thomas R. Nilsen. 320.
Dorsch, T. S., ed. *Julius Caesar.* By William Shakespeare. Rev. by Pat. M. Ryan, Jr. 423.
Doughty, W. L. *John Wesley: Preacher.* Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 417.
Downer, Alan S. The Theatre of Illusion: Notes of a Theatrical Tourist. 345.
——— *The Art of the Play: An Anthology of Nine Plays.* Rev. by W. David Sievers. 202.

——— Rev.: *Dramatic Theory: A Bibliography*. Richard B. Vowles. 311.
Drum, Dale D. Rev.: *The Initial Interview in Psychiatric Practice*. Merton Gill, Richard Newman, and Fredrick C. Redlich. 100.
——— Rev.: *Notebook for Public Speaking*. Ray Ehrensberger and Elaine Pagel. 211.
——— Rev.: *The Sane Society*. Erich Fromm. 87.

Edney, Clarence W., Wendell Johnson, Spencer F. Brown, James F. Curtis, and Jacqueline Keaster. *Speech Handicapped School Children*. Rev. by Wayne L. Thurman. 325.
Ehrensberger, Ray and Elaine Pagel. *Notebook for Public Speaking*. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 211.
Ehrsam, Theodore G. Rev.: *How to Overcome Nervous Tension and Speak Well in Public*. Alfred Tack. 324.
——— Rev.: *Speech and Your Personality*. Theodore F. Nelson and W. Kirtley Atkinson. 90.
Eich, Louis M. and Lionel Crocker. *Oral Reading*. Rev. by Donald E. Hargis. 439.
Eisenstadt, Arthur. Rev.: *Communicative Speech*. R. T. Oliver, D. C. Dickey, and H. P. Zelko. 96.
Ellingsworth, Huber W. Rev.: *Discussion*. William S. Howell and Donald K. Smith. 435.
Ellis, Carroll. Rev.: *Alexander Campbell as a Preacher*. Archibald McLean. 210.
Ellis, William D. and Frank Siedell. *How to Win the Conference*. Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 92.
Enfield, Gertrude Dixon. *Holiday Book for Verse Choirs*. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 99.
Evans, F. Bowen, ed. *Worldwide Communist Propaganda Activities*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.

Fessenden, Seth, Johnnye Akin, P. Merville Larson, and Albert N. Williams. *Helping the Bible Speak*. Rev. by Harold C. Svanoe. 320.
Fiske, Marjorie, Robert K. Merton and Patricia L. Kendall. *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures*. Rev. by Elton S. Carter. 322.
Fitch, Waring J., Alice Streng, Le Roy D. Hedgecock, James W. Phillips, and James A. Carrell. *Hearing Therapy for Children*. Rev. by Albert Murphy. 88.
Flynn, Lawrence J., S.J. The *De Arte Rhetorica* of Cyprian Soarez, S.J. 367.
Forbush, Bliss. *Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal*. Rev. by David C. Ralph. 418.
Ford, George D. *These Were Actors: A Story of the Chapmans and the Drakes*. Rev. by Elbert R. Bowen. 311.
Ford, P. and G. *A Guide to Parliamentary Papers*. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 209.
Foster, Eugene S. Rev.: *Auditing for TV*. Martin Begley and Douglas MacCrae. 208.
——— Rev.: *The Television Actor's Manual*. William Hodapp. 208.
Frampton, Merle E. and Elena D. Gall, eds. *Special Education for the Exceptional*. Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 314.
Freedley, George and John A. Reeves. *A History of the Theatre*. Rev. by Thomas D. Pawley. 327.
Freeley, Austin J. Rev.: *Effective Speaking in Business*. Alfred D. Huston and Robert A. Sandberg, revised by Jack Mills. 96.
Freidson, Eliot. The Varieties of Individual Speech. 355.
Fromm, Erich. *The Sane Society*. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 87.

Gall, Elena D. and Merle E. Frampton, eds. *Special Education for the Exceptional*. Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 314.
Gans, Leo, Clifford Lee Brownell and Tufie Z. Maroon. *Public Relations in Education*. Rev. by Howard Stephenson. 98.
Gard, Robert. *Grassroots Theater. A Search for Regional Arts in America*. Rev. by E. J. West. 427.
Gardner, Warren H. The Laryngectomees Organize. 270.
Gardner, Wofford G. Rev.: *Principles and Types of Speech*. Alan H. Monroe. 95.
——— Rev.: *Working for More Effective Speech*. Harvey Cromwell. 95.
Geiger, Don. Recent Literary Criticism. 298.
——— *Unexpected Truce*. Rev. by Charlotte I. Lee. 429.
Gill, Merton, Richard Newman, and Fredrick C. Redlich. *The Initial Interview in Psychiatric Practice*. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 100.
Golden, James L. Hilliard vs. Yancey: Prelude to the Civil War. 35.
Gondin, William R. Rev.: *Santayana and the Sense of Beauty*. Willard E. Arnett. 430.
Gordon, Thomas. *Group-Centered Leadership*. Rev. by Dean C. Barnlund. 93.
Gould, Harold V. Rev.: *The Theatre Annual, 1955*, ed. Blanche A. Corwin. 82.
Griffin, Leland M. Thoughts on Anthologies. 70.
——— Rev.: *Are You a Good Listener?* Harold P. Zelko. 98.
——— New Books in Review. 70.
——— New Books in Review. 187.
——— New Books in Review. 298.
——— New Books in Review. 411.
Grimes, Wilma H. Choosing Literature for Oral Reading: A Psychological Basis. 133.
Grube, G. M. A. Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. 339.
Gunderson, Robert Gray. Rev.: *The Life of Matthew Simpson*. Robert D. Clark. 307.

Haberman, Frederick W. Logical Proof in Salem. 411.
——— Rev.: *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder*. James A. Winans and Howard A. Bradley. 411.
Hale, Lester L. Rev.: *Speech After Laryngectomy*. Louis M. Di Carlo, Walter W. Amster, and Gilbert R. Herer. 431.
Haller, William. *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 79.
Hargis, Donald E. Rev.: *Oral Reading*. Lionel Crocker and Louis M. Eich. 439.
Harnack, R. Victor. Rev.: *Guidance in Groups*. Margaret E. Bennett. 206.

Harrington, Elbert W. The Academic and the Rhetorical Modes of Thought. 25.
Harshbarger, H. Clay and Samuel L. Becker. Teaching by Discussion on Television. 375.
Hawk, Sara Stinchfield and Edna Hill Young. *Moto-Kinesthetic Speech Training*. Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 325.
Heath, Eric. *Writing for Television*. Rev. by Harold E. Nelson. 212.
Hedgecock, Le Roy D., Alice Streng, Waring J. Fitch, James W. Phillips, and James A. Carrell. *Hearing Therapy for Children*. Rev. by Albert Murphy. 88.
Heffner, Hubert. Rev.: *English Drama of the Middle Ages*. Hardin Craig. 199.
Heltman, Harry J. *Trippingly on the Tongue*. Rev. by Louise Kingman. 314.
Herer, Gilbert R., Louis M. Di Carlo, and Walter W. Amster. *Speech After Laryngectomy*. Rev. by Lester L. Hale. 431.
Hitchcock, Orville. Rev.: *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards from his Private Notebooks*, ed. Harvey G. Townsend. 440.
Hitchman, Percy J. Spoken English and the Teachers' Certificate in England. 144.
Hochmuth, Marie Kathryn, ed. *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*. Vol. III. Rev. by Everett L. Hunt. 187.
Hodapp, William. *The Television Actor's Manual*. Rev. by Eugene S. Foster. 208.
Hodgkinson, Harry. *The Language of Communism*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R*. Rev. by Robert D. Clark. 420.
——— and Walter P. Metzger. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. Rev. by George P. Rice, Jr. 80.
Holm, James N. Rev.: *Public Speaking for College Students*. Lionel Crocker. 323.
Honigmann, E. A. J., ed. *King John*. By William Shakespeare. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.
Howell, Wilbur Samuel. The Forum. A New Editor Takes Over. 407.
——— *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 304.
Howell, William S. and Donald K. Smith. *Discussion*. Rev. by Huber W. Ellingsworth. 435.
——— Rev.: *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1955*, ed. Marshall R. Jones. 205.
——— Rev.: *Opinions and Personality*. M. Brewster Smith, Jerome S. Bruner, and Robert W. White. 318.
Howse, Ernest Marshall. *Spiritual Values in Shakespeare*. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 93.
Hoyt, Harlowe R. *Town Hall Tonight*. Rev. by Richard Moody. 201.
Hudson, Roy F. Rev.: *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes*. Maurice F. Reidy, S.J. 192.
——— Rev.: *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. William Haller. 79.
Hultzén, Lee S. Rev.: *Language: A Modern Synthesis*. Joshua Whatmough. 315.
Hunt, Everett L. Thoughts on a History and Criticism of American Public Address. 187.
Hunt, H. A. K. *The Humanism of Cicero*. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 78.
Huston, Alfred D. and Robert Sandberg, revised by Jack Mills. *Effective Speaking in Business*. Rev. by Austin J. Freeley. 96.

Inkeles, Alex. *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.

Jackson, Edgar N. *How to Preach to People's Needs*. Rev. by Lowell G. McCoy. 437.
Jackson, James L. Air Force Language in the Making. 14.
Johnson, Albert E. The Forum. Source Materials in the Field of Theatre. 409.
——— Rev.: *Advice to a Young Critic and Other Letters*. By Bernard Shaw, ed. E. J. West. 427.
Johnson, Edgar. *One Mighty Torrent: The Drama of Biography*. Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 82.
Johnson, Joseph E. and Raymond Dennett, eds. *Negotiating with the Russians*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Johnson, Wendell, Spencer F. Frown, James F. Curtis, Clarence W. Edney, and Jacqueline Keaster. *Speech Handicapped School Children*. Rev. by Wayne L. Thurman. 325.
Johnston, George Burke, ed. *Poems of Ben Jonson*. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 100.
Jones, E. Winston. Rev.: *John Wesley: Preacher*. W. L. Doughty. 417.
——— Rev.: *Spiritual Values in Shakespeare*. Ernest Marshall Howse. 93.
Jones, Ilion T. *Principles and Practice of Preaching*. Rev. by Edmund Holt Linn. 437.
Jones, Marshall R., ed. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1955*. Rev. by William S. Howell. 205.
Joy, Admiral C. Turner. *How Communists Negotiate*. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Judd, Gerrit P., IV. *Members of Parliament 1734-1832*. Rev. by Charles Daniel Smith. 416.

Kaufman, William I., ed. *How to Write for Television*. Rev. by Harold E. Nelson. 209.
——— *How to Direct for Television*. Rev. by William J. Lewis. 323.
Kaulhausen, Marie-Hed. *Die Gestalt Des Gedichtes, Seine Sprechkundliche Interpretation Und Nachgestaltung*. Rev. by Eugene Bahn. 431.
Keaster, Jacqueline, Wendell Johnson, Spencer F. Brown, James F. Curtis, and Clarence W. Edney. *Speech Handicapped School Children*. Rev. by Wayne L. Thurman. 325.
Keltner, John and Carroll C. Arnold. Discussion in American Colleges and Universities. 250.
Kendall, Patricia L., Robert K. Merton and Marjorie Fiske. *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures*. Rev. by Elton S. Carter. 321.
Kermode, Frank, ed. *The Tempest*. By William Shakespeare. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.
Kerr, Walter. *How Not to Write a Play*. Rev. by E. J. West. 427.

Kingman, Louise. Rev.: *Trippingly on the Tongue*. Harry J. Heltman. 314.

Knight, G. Wilson. *The Mutual Flame: On Shakespeare's Sonnets and the Phoenix and the Turtle*. Rev. by Wallace A. Bacon. 201.

Kökeritz, Helge. *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation*. Rev. by D. W. Robertson, Jr. 326.

Kooken, Olive and Archie Binns. *Mrs. Fiske and the American Theatre*. Rev. by Garff B. Wilson. 310.

Larson, P. Merville, Johnnye Akin, Seth Fessenden, and Albert N. Williams. *Helping the Bible Speak*. Rev. by Harold C. Svanoe. 320.

——— Rev.: *N. F. S. Grundtvig: An American Study*. Ernest D. Nielsen. 195.

Ledbetter, Frances, Thomas Pollock, Marion Sheridan and Ronald Doll. *The Art of Communicating*. Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 90.

Lee, Charlotte I. Rev.: *Unexpected Truce*. Don Geiger. 429.

Lewis, William J. Rev.: *How to Direct for Television*, ed. William I. Kaufman. 323.

Linn, Edmund Holt. Rev.: *Principles and Practice of Preaching*. Ilion T. Jones. 437.

——— Rev.: *Sent Forth To Preach*. Jesse Burton Weatherspoon. 94.

Lippman, Monroe. Philip Barry and his Socio-Political Attitudes. 151.

Loring, J. G. C., S. S. Stevens and Dorothy Cohen. *Bibliography on Hearing*. Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 98.

MacCrae, Douglas and Martin Begley. *Auditioning for TV*. Rev. by Eugene S. Foster. 208.

MacIver, Robert M. *Academic Freedom in our Time*. Rev. by George P. Rice, Jr. 80.

Maroon, Tufie Z., Clifford Lee Brownell and Leo Gans. *Public Relations in Education*. Rev. by Howard Stephenson. 98.

Marquis, Vivienne and M. Joseph Dooher, eds. *Effective Communication*. Rev. by Thomas R. Nilsen. 320.

Martin, Robert C. Rev.: *The Staff Role in Management*. Robert C. Sampson. 92.

McCoy, Lowell G. Rev.: *How to Preach to People's Needs*. Edgar N. Jackson. 437.

McGarry, Daniel D., tr. *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury*. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 78.

McGaw, Charles J. *Acting is Believing*. Rev. by John Robson. 204.

McLean, Archibald. *Alexander Campbell as a Preacher*. Rev. by Carroll Ellis. 210.

McLeod, A. L. Rev.: *The Pronunciation of English in Australia*. A. G. Mitchell. 207.

Merritt, Francine. Rev.: *The Art of Interpretative Speech*. Severina E. Nelson and Charles H. Woolbert. 319.

Merton, Robert K., Marjorie Fiske and Patricia L. Kendall. *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures*. Rev. by Elton S. Carter. 321.

Metzger, Walter P. and Richard Hofstadter. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. Rev. by George P. Rice, Jr. 80.

Miers, Earl Schenck and Paul M. Angle, eds. *The Living Lincoln*. Rev. by Barnet Baskerville. 194.

Miller, Virginia R. Rev.: *Handbook of Speech Improvement*. Charles Kenneth Thomas. 312.

Mills, Jack, Alfred D. Huston and Robert A. Sandberg. *Effective Speaking in Business*. Rev. by Austin J. Freeley. 96.

Minnick, Wayne C. Rev.: *The Road to Persuasion*. William Muehl. 435.

Mitchell, A. G. *The Pronunciation of English in Australia*. Rev. by A. L. McLeod. 207.

Moncur, John P. A Comparative Analysis of [u-U] Variants in the San Francisco and Los Angeles Areas. 31.

Monroe, Alan H. *Principles and Types of Speech*. Rev. by Wofford G. Gardner. 95.

Moody, Richard. Rev.: *Town Hall Tonight*. Harlowe R. Hoyt. 201.

Muehl, William. *The Road to Persuasion*. Rev. by Wayne C. Minnick. 435.

Murphy, Albert. Rev.: *Hearing Therapy for Children*. Alice Streng, Waring J. Fitch, Le Roy D. Hedgecock, James W. Phillips, and James A. Carrell. 88.

Murphy, James J. Rev.: *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*, ed. Maurice Platnauer. 97.

——— Rev.: *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury*, tr. Daniel D. McGarry. 78.

——— Rev.: *The Roman Mind: Studies in the History of Thought from Cicero to Marcus Aurelius*. Martin L. Clarke. 439.

Murphy, Richard. Rev.: *Triumph of the Eggheads*. Horace Coon. 197.

Murray, Elwood. Rev.: *Present Day Psychology*, ed. A. A. Roback. 86.

Nadeau, Ray. Rev.: *The Young Augustine*. John J. O'Meara. 191.

Nelson, Harold E. Rev.: *How to Write for Television*, ed. William I. Kaufman. 209.

——— Rev.: *Writing for Television*. Eric Heath. 212.

Nelson, Severina E. and Charles H. Woolbert. *The Art of Interpretative Speech*. Rev. by Francine Merritt. 319.

Nelson, Theodore F. and W. Kirtley Atkinson. *Speech and Your Personality*. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 90.

Nesbit, F. F. *Language, Meaning and Reality: A Study of Symbolism*. Rev. by Robert Albright. 434.

New England Speech Association. *A Handbook for Speech Improvement: Kindergarten—Grades One to Six*. Rev. by John J. Pruis. 313.

Newman, Richard, Merton Gill and Fredrick C. Redlich. *The Initial Interview in Psychiatric Practice*. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 100.

Nielsen, Ernest D. *N. F. S. Grundtvig: An American Study*. Rev. by P. Merville Larson. 195.

Nilsen, Thomas R. Criticism and Social Consequences. 173.
——— Rev.: *Effective Communication*, eds. M. Joseph Dooher and Vivienne Marquis. 320.
Nogami, Toyoichiro. *Japanese Noh Plays: How to See Them*. Rev. by Margaret C. Young. 100.
North, Helen F. Rhetoric and Historiography. 234.
Nosworthy, J. M., ed. *Cymbeline*. By William Shakespeare. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.

O'Brien, Joseph F. Henry M. Robert as a Presiding Officer. 157.
Oliver, R. T., D. C. Dickey, and H. P. Zelko. *Communicative Speech*. Rev. by Arthur Eisenstadt. 96.
Oliver, Robert T. Rev.: *How Communists Negotiate*. Admiral C. Turner Joy. 421.
——— Rev.: *The Language of Communism*. Harry Hodgkinson. 421.
——— Rev.: *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion*. Alex Inkeles. 421.
——— Rev.: *Negotiating with the Russians*, ed. Raymond Dennett and Joseph E. Johnson. 421.
——— Rev.: *Worldwide Communist Propaganda Activities*, ed. F. Bowen Evans. 421.
O'Meara, John J. *The Young Augustine*. Rev. by Ray Nadeau. 191.

Pagel, Elaine and Ray Ehrensberger. *Notebook for Public Speaking*. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 211.
Parker, Everett C., David W. Barry and Dallas W. Smythe. *The Television-Radio Audience and Religion*. Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 322.
Pawley, Thomas D. Rev.: *A History of the Theatre*. George Freedley and John A. Reeves. 327.
Perkins, Lindsey S. Rev.: *Henry Watterson: Reconstructed Rebel*. Joseph Frazier Wall. 419.
Phifer, Gregg. Rev.: *How to Win the Conference*. Frank Siedell and William D. Ellis. 92.
Philbrick, Norman. Rev.: *English Stage Comedy*, ed. W. K. Wimsatt, Jr. 424.
Phillips, David C. *Oral Communication in Business*. Rev. by Milton J. Wiksell. 91.
——— Rev.: *How to Sell and Unsell Ideas*. Fred De Armond. 98.
Phillips, James W., Alice Streng, Waring J. Fitch, Le Roy D. Hedgecock, and James A. Carrell. *Hearing Therapy for Children*. Rev. by Albert Murphy. 88.
Pitts, Willis N., Jr. Rev.: *The Art of Communicating*. Thomas Pollock, Marion Sheridan, Frances Ledbetter and Ronald Doll. 90.
Platnauer, Maurice, ed. *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 97.
Pollock, Thomas, Marion Sheridan, Frances Ledbetter and Ronald Doll. *The Art of Communication*. Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 90.
Powell, Vio Mae. Rev.: *The Dramatic Story of the Theatre*. Dorothy and Joseph Samachson. 101.
Pronovost, Wilbert. Rev.: *Bibliography on Hearing*. S. S. Stevens, J. G. C. Loring and Dorothy Cohen. 98.
——— Rev.: *Speech in the Elementary Classroom*. Charles Van Riper and Katherine G. Butler. 87.
Pruis, John J. Rev.: *A Handbook for Speech Improvement: Kindergarten—Grades One to Six*. New England Speech Association. 313.

Ralph, David C. Rev.: *Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal*. Bliss Forbush. 418.
Randall, J. G. and Richard N. Current. *Lincoln the President: Last Full Measure*. Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 77.
Raubicheck, Letitia. *Choral Speaking is Fun*. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 99.
——— Rev: *Your Voice is You*. Myrtle H. Cannon. 99.
Redlich, Frederick C., Merton Gill, and Richard Newman. *The Initial Interview in Psychiatric Practice*. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 100.
Reeves, John A. and George Freedley. *A History of the Theatre*. Rev. by Thomas D. Pawley. 327.
Reid, Loren. Speech in the Maryland Overseas Program. 379.
Reid, Ronald F. Edward Everett: Rhetorician of Nationalism, 1824-1855. 273.
Reidy, Maurice F., S.J. *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes*. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 192.
Rice, George P., Jr. Rev.: *Academic Freedom in Our Time*. Robert M. MacIver. 80.
——— Rev.: *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger. 80.
——— Rev.: *The Expansion of Elizabethan England*. A. L. Rowse. 191.
Richards, I. A. *Speculative Instruments*. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 198.
Roback, A. A., ed. *Present Day Psychology*. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 86.
Robertson, D. W., Jr. Rev.: *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation*. Helge Kökeritz. 326.
Robinson, James A. and Russel Windes, Jr. Public Address in the Career of Adlai E. Stevenson. 225.
Robson, John. Rev.: *Acting is Believing*. Charles J. McGaw. 204.
Rowse, A. L. *The Expansion of Elizabethan England*. Rev. by George P. Rice, Jr. 191.
Rutland, Robert Allen. *The Birth of the Bill of Rights*. Rev. by George V. Bohman. 193.
Ryan, Pat M., Jr. Rev.: *Cymbeline*. By William Shakespeare, ed. J. M. Nosworthy. 84.
——— Rev.: *Freud on Broadway: A History of Psychoanalysis and the American Drama*. H. David Sievers. 199.
——— Rev.: *Julius Caesar*. By William Shakespeare, ed. T. S. Dorsch. 423.
——— Rev.: *King John*. By William Shakespeare, ed. E. A. J. Honigmann. 84.

——— Rev.: *The Merchant of Venice.* By William Shakespeare, ed. J. R. Brown. 84.
——— Rev.: *Nine Great Plays: From Aeschylus to Eliot,* ed. Leonard F. Dean. 210.
——— Rev.: *Poems of Ben Jonson,* ed. George Burke Johnston. 100.
——— Rev.: *The Tempest.* By William Shakespeare, ed. Frank Kermode. 84.

Samachson, Dorothy and Joseph. *The Dramatic Story of the Theatre.* Rev. by Vio Mae Powell. 101.
Sampson, Robert C. *The Staff Role in Management.* Rev. by Robert C. Martin. 92.
Sandberg, Robert and Alfred D. Huston, revised by Jack Mills. *Effective Speaking in Business.* Rev. by Austin J. Freeley. 96.
Sheridan, Marion, Thomas Pollock, Frances Ledbetter and Ronald Doll. *The Art of Communicating.* Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 90.
Siedell, Frank and William D. Ellis. *How to Win the Conference.* Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 92.
Sievers, W. David. *Freud on Broadway: A History of Psychoanalysis and the American Drama.* Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 199.
——— Rev.: *The Art of the Play: An Anthology of Nine Plays.* Alan S. Downer. 202.
Slade, Peter. *Child Drama.* Rev. by Richard G. Adams. 203.
Smith, Brewster M., Jerome S. Bruner, and Robert W. White. *Opinions and Personality.* Rev. by William S. Howell. 318.
Smith, Charles Daniel. Rev.: *Members of Parliament 1734-1832.* Gerrit P. Judd, IV. 416.
Smith, Donald K. and William S. Howell. *Discussion.* Rev. by Huber W. Ellingsworth. 435.
Smith, Henry Lee, Jr. *Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English.* Rev. by Harold B. Allen. 362.
Smythe, Dallas W., Everett C. Parker and David W. Barry. *The Television-Radio Audience and Religion.* Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 322.
Snow, Vernon F. Robert C. Johnson's Appraisal of Edmund Burke's Eloquence. 243.
Soper, Paul. *Basic Public Speaking.* Rev. by Wayne E. Brockriede. 324.
Spurgeon, C. H. *Lectures to My Students.* Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 210.
Starmer, Garrett L. Rev.: *Credit Courses by Television.* American Council on Education. 208.
——— Rev.: *Television Techniques.* Hoyland Bettinger. 211.
Stephenson, Howard. Rev.: *Public Relations in Education.* Clifford Lee Brownell, Leo Gans and Tufie Z. Maroon. 98.
Stephenson, Wendell Holmes. *The South Lives in History: Southern Historians and their Legacy.* Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 193.
Stevens, Cj. John Pickering's "Uniform Orthography." 139.
Stevens, S. S., J. G. C. Loring and Dorothy Cohen. *Bibliography on Hearing.* Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 98.
Stovall, Floyd, ed. *The Development of American Literary Criticism.* Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 81.
Streng, Alice, Waring J. Fitch, Le Roy D. Hedgecock, James W. Phillips, and James A. Carrell. *Hearing Therapy for Children.* Rev. by Albert Murphy. 88.
Svanoe, Harold C. Rev.: *Helping the Bible Speak.* Johnnye Akin, Seth Fessenden, P. Merville Larson, and Albert N. Williams. 320.

Tack, Alfred. *How to Overcome Nervc 's Tension and Speak Well in Public.* Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 324.
Thomas, Charles Kenneth. *Handbook of Speech Improvement.* Rev. by Virginia R. Miller. 312.
Thompson, David W. Interpretative Reading as Symbolic Action. 389.
Thurman, A. L., Jr. Rev.: *Main Street on the Middle Border.* Lewis Atherton. 196.
——— Rev.: *Representative American Speeches: 1954-1955,* ed. A. Craig Baird. 309.
Thurman, Bedford. Rev.: *The Flower in Drama and Glamour: Theatre Essays and Criticism.* Stark Young. 83.
Thurman, Wayne L. Rev.: *Speech Handicapped School Children.* Wendell Johnson, Spencer F. Brown, James F. Curtis, Clarence W. Edney, and Jacqueline Keaster. 325.
Townsend, Harvey G., ed. *The Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards from his Private Notebooks.* Rev. by Orville Hitchcock. 440.

Van Riper, Charles and Katherine G. Butler. *Speech in the Elementary Classroom.* Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 87.
von Foerster, Heinz, ed. *Cybernetics.* Rev. by Harry L. Weinberg. 318.
Vowles, Richard B. *Dramatic Theory: A Bibliography.* Rev. by Alan S. Downer. 311.

Wall, Joseph Frazier. *Henry Watterson: Reconstructed Rebel.* Rev. by Lindsey S. Perkins. 419.
Wallace, Karl R. Aspects of Modern Rhetoric in Francis Bacon. 398.
Watkins, Lloyd I. Lord Brougham's Authorship of Rhetorical Articles in the *Edinburgh Review.* 55.
Weatherspoon, Jesse Burton. *Sent Forth To Preach.* Rev. by Edmund H. Linn. 94.
Weinberg, Harry L. Rev.: *Cybernetics,* ed. Heinz von Foerster. 318.
Wells, Charlotte G. Rev.: *Moto-Kinesthetic Speech Training.* Edna Hill Young and Sara Stinchfield Hawk. 325.
West, E. J. ed., *Advice to a Young Critic and Other Letters.* By Bernard Shaw. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 427.
——— Rev.: *Grassroots Theater. A Search for Regional Arts in America.* Robert Gard. 427.

——— Rev.: *How Not to Write a Play*. Walter Kerr. 427.
Whatmough, Joshua. *Language: A Modern Synthesis*. Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 315.
White, Robert W., M. Brewster Smith, and Jerome S. Bruner. *Opinions and Personality*. Rev. by William S. Howell. 318.
Wiksell, Milton J. Rev.; *Oral Communication*. David C. Phillips. 91.
Wiley, Earl W. The Enthymeme: Idiom of Persuasion. 19.
——— Rev.: *Lincoln the President: Last Full Measure*. J. G. Randall and Richard N. Current. 77.
Williams, Albert N., Johnnye Akin, Seth Fessenden, and P. Merville Larson. *Helping the Bible Speak*. Rev. by Harold C. Svanoe. 320.
Wilson, Garff B. Emotionalism in Acting. 45.
——— Rev. *Mrs. Fiske and the American Theatre*. Archie Binns and Olive Kooken. 310.
Wimsatt, W. K. Jr., ed. *English Stage Comedy*. Rev. by Norman Philbrick. 424.
Winans, James A. and Howard A. Bradley. *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder*. Rev. by Frederick W. Haberman. 411.
Windes, Russel, Jr., and James A. Robinson. Public Address in the Career of Adlai E. Stevenson. 225.
Winslow, Donald J. Rev.: *One Mighty Torrent: The Drama of Biography*. Edgar Johnson. 82.
Woolbert, Charles H. and Severina E. Nelson. *The Art of Interpretative Speech*. Rev. by Francine Merritt. 319.
Wright, Laura F. Rev.: *Listening for Speech Sounds*. Empress Y. Zedler. 89.

Young, Margaret C. Rev.: *Japanese Noh Plays: How to See Them*. Toyoichiro Nogami. 100.
Young, Edna Hill and Sara Stinchfield Hawk. *Moto-Kinesthetic Speech Training*. Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 325.
Young, Stark. *The Flower in Drama and Glamour: Theatre Essays and Criticism*. Rev. by Bedford Thurman. 83.

Zelko, Harold P. *Are You a Good Listener?* Rev. by Leland M. Griffin. 98.
——— R. T. Oliver, and D. C. Dickey. *Communicative Speech*. Rev. by Arthur Eisenstadt. 96.

ARTICLES

Academic and the Rhetorical Modes of Thought, The. Elbert W. Harrington. 25.
Aesthetics and Stage Design. Willard F. Bellman. 257.
Air Force Language in the Making. James L. Jackson. 14.
Aspects of Modern Rhetoric in Francis Bacon. Karl R. Wallace. 398.
Auden's "September 1, 1939": An Interpreter's Analysis. Daphne Nicholson Bennett. 1.
Burke's *Present Discontents:* The Rhetorical Genesis of a Party Testament. Donald C. Bryant. 115.
Choosing Literature for Oral Reading: A Psychological Basis. Wilma H. Grimes. 133.
Comparative Analysis of [u-U] Variants in the San Francisco and Los Angeles Areas, A. John P. Moncur. 31.
Criticism and Social Consequences. Thomas R. Nilsen. 173.
De Arte Rhetorica of Cyprian Soarez, S.J., The. Lawrence J. Flynn, S.J. 367.
Discussion in American Colleges and Universities. John Keltner and Carroll C. Arnold. 250.
Edward Everett: Rhetorician of Nationalism, 1824-1855. Ronald F. Reid. 273.
Emotionalism in Acting. Garff B. Wilson. 45.
English in Greece. James W. Abel. 263.
Entertain to Educate. Le Roy Bannerman. 170.
Functions of Rhetorical Criticism, The. Albert J. Croft. 283.
Henry M. Robert as a Presiding Officer. Joseph F. O"Brien. 157.
Hilliard vs. Yancey: Prelude to the Civil War. James L. Golden. 35.
Idiom of Persuasion. Earl W. Wiley. 19.
Interpretative Reading as Symbolic Action. David W. Thompson. 389.
John Pickering's "Uniform Orthography." Cj Stevens. 139.
Laryngectomees Organize, The. Warren H. Gardner. 270.
Lord Brougham's Authorship of Rhetorical Articles in the *Edinburgh Review*. Lloyd I. Watkins. 55.
Notes on Frost the Lecturer. Reginald L. Cook. 127.
Philip Barry and his Socio-Political Attitudes. Monroe Lippman. 151.
Public Address in the Career of Adlai E. Stevenson. Russel Windes, Jr. and James A. Robinson. 225.
Rhetoric and Historiography. Helen F. North. 234.
Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. G. M. A. Grube. 339.
Robert C. Johnson's Appraisal of Edmund Burke's Eloquence. Vernon F. Snow. 243.
Speech in the Maryland Overseas Program Loren Reid. 379.
Spoken English and the Teacher's Certificate in England. Percy J. Hitchman. 144.
Stanley Baldwin's Speech on the Abdication of Edward VIII. James C. Ching. 163.
Teaching by Discussion on Television. H. Clay Harshbarger and Samuel L. Becker. 375.
Theatre of Illusion, The: Notes of a Theatrical Tourist. Alan S. Downer. 345.
Varieties of Individual Speech, The. Eliot Freidson. 355.
Whither the Humanities? Donald C. Bryant. 363.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

Academic Freedom in Our Time. Robert M. MacIver. Rev. by George P. Rice, Jr. 80.
Acting is Believing. Charles J. McGaw. Rev. by John Robson. 204.

Advice to a Young Critic and Other Letters. By Bernard Shaw. E. J. West, ed. Rev. by Albert E. Johnson. 427.

Age of Reform, The: From Bryan to F.D.R. Richard Hofstadter. Rev. by Robert D. Clark. 420.

Alexander Campbell as a Preacher. Archibald McLean. Rev. by Carroll Ellis. 210.

American Lyceum, The: Town Meeting of the Mind. Carl Bode. Rev. by Waldo W. Braden. 306.

American Public Addresses: 1740-1952. A. Craig, Baird, ed. Rev. by Bower Aly. 416.

Anthony Eden: The Chronicle of a Career. Lewis Broad. Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 308.

Are You a Good Listener? Harold P. Zelko. Rev. by Leland M. Griffin. 98.

Art of Communicating, The. Thomas Pollock, Marion Sheridan, Frances Ledbetter and Ronald Doll. Rev. by Willis N. Pitts, Jr. 90.

Art of Interpretative Speech, The. Charles H. Woolbert and Severina E. Nelson. Rev. by Francine Merritt. 319.

Art of the Play, The: An Anthology of Nine Plays. Alan S. Downer. Rev. by W. David Sievers. 202.

Auditing for TV. Martin Begley and Douglas MacCrae. Rev. by Eugene S. Foster. 208.

Basic Public Speaking. Paul Soper. Rev. by Wayne E. Brockriede. 324.

Bibliography on Hearing. S. S. Stevens, J. G. C. Loring and Dorothy Cohen. Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 98.

Billy Graham: A Mission Accomplished. George Burnham. Rev. by Richard K. Curtis. 438.

Birth of the Bill of Rights, The. Robert Allen Rutland. Rev. by George V. Bohman. 193.

Bishop Lancelot Andrewes. Maurice F. Reidy, S.J. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 192.

Carleton Drama Review, The. Robert W. Corrigan, ed. Rev. 212.

Child Drama. Peter Slade. Rev. by Richard G. Adams. 203.

Choral Speaking is Fun. Letitia Raubicheck. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 99.

Communicative Speech. R. T. Oliver, D. C. Dickey, and H. P. Zelko. Rev. by Arthur Eisenstadt. 96.

Credit Courses by Television. American Council on Education. Rev. by Garrett L. Starmer. 208.

Cybernetics. Heinz von Foerster, ed. Rev. by Harry L. Weinberg. 318.

Cymbeline. By William Shakespeare. J. M. Nosworthy, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.

Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder. Howard A. Bradley and James A. Winans. Rev. by Frederick W. Haberman. 411.

Development of Academic Freedom in the United States, The. Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger. Rev. by George P. Rice. 80.

Development of American Literary Criticism, The. Floyd Stovall, ed. Rev. by Guy A. Cardwell. 81.

Die Gestalt Des Gedichtes, Seine Sprechkundliche Interpretation Und Nachgestaltung. Marie-Hed Kaulhausen. Rev. by Eugene Bahn. 431.

Discussion. William S. Howell and Donald K. Smith. Rev. by Huber W. Ellingsworth. 435.

Dramatic Story of the Theatre, The. Dorothy and Joseph Samachson. Rev. by Vio Mae Powell. 101.

Dramatic Theory: A Bibliography. Richard B. Vowles. Rev. by Alan S. Downer. 311.

Eden: The Making of a Statesman. Alan Campbell-Johnson. Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 308.

Effective Communication on the Job. M. Joseph Dooher and Vivienne Marquis, eds. Rev. by Thomas R. Nilsen. 320.

Effective Speaking in Business. Alfred D. Huston and Robert Sandberg, revised by Jack Mills. Rev. by Austin J. Freeley. 96.

Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal. Bliss Forbush. Rev. by David C. Ralph. 418.

English Drama of the Middle Ages. Hardin Craig. Rev. by Hubert Heffner. 199.

English Stage Comedy. W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., ed. Rev. by Norman Philbrick. 424.

Expansion of Elizabethan England, The. A. L. Rowse. Rev. by George P. Rice, Jr. 191.

Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship. Maurice Platnauer, ed. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 97.

Flower in Drama and Glamour, The: Theatre Essays and Criticism. Stark Young. Rev. by Bedford Thurman. 83.

Focused Interview, The: A Manual of Problems and Procedures. Robert K. Merton, Marjorie Fiske and Patricia L. Kendall. Rev. by Elton S. Carter. 321.

Freud on Broadway: A History of Psychoanalysis and the American Drama. H. David Sievers. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 199.

Grassroots Theater. A Search for Regional Arts in America. Robert Gard. Rev. by E. J. West. 427.

Group-Centered Leadership. Thomas Gordon. Rev. by Dean C. Barnlund. 93.

Guidance in Groups. Margaret E. Bennett. Rev. by R. Victor Harnack. 206.

Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation, A. Helge Kökeritz. Rev. by D. W. Robertson, Jr. 326.

Guide to Parliamentary Papers, A. P. and G. Ford. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 209.

Handbook for Speech Improvement, A: Kindergarten—Grades One to Six. New England Speech Association. Rev. by John J. Pruis. 313.

Handbook of Speech Improvement. Charles Kenneth Thomas. Rev. by Virginia R. Miller. 312.

Hearing Therapy for Children. Alice Streng, Waring J. Fitch, Le Roy D. Hedgecock, James W. Phillips, and James A. Carrell. Rev. by Albert Murphy. 88.

Helping the Bible Speak. Johnnye Akin, Seth Fessenden, P. Merville Larson, and Albert N. Williams. Rev. by Harold C. Svanoe. 320.

Henry Watterson: Reconstructed Rebel. Joseph Frazier Wall. Rev. by Lindsey S. Perkins. 419.
History and Criticism of American Public Address, A. Vol. III. Marie Kathryn Hochmuth, ed. Rev. by Everett L. Hunt. 187.
History of the Theatre, A. George Freedley and John A. Reeves. Rev. by Thomas D. Pawley. 327.
Holiday Book for Verse Choirs. Gertrude Dixon Enfield. Rev. by Johnnye Akin. 99.
How Communists Negotiate. Admiral C. Turner Joy. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
How Not to Write a Play. Walter Kerr. Rev. by E. J. West. 427.
How to Direct for Television. William I. Kaufman, ed. Rev. by William J. Lewis. 323.
How to Overcome Nervous Tension and Speak Well in Public. Alfred Tack. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 324.
How to Preach to People's Needs. Edgar N. Jackson. Rev. by Lowell G. McCoy. 437.
How to Sell and Unsell Ideas. Fred De Armond. Rev. by David C. Phillips. 98.
How to Win the Conference. William D. Ellis and Frank Siedel. Rev. by Gregg Phifer. 92.
How to Write for Television. William I. Kaufman, ed. Rev. by Harold E. Nelson. 209.
Humanism of Cicero, The. H. A. K. Hunt. Rev. by Otto A. Dieter. 78.
Initial Interview in Psychiatric Practice, The. Merton Gill, Richard Newman, and Fredrick C. Redlich. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 100.
Japanese Noh Plays: How to See Them. Toyoichiro Nogami. Rev. by Margaret C. Young. 100.
John Wesley: Preacher. W. L. Doughty. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 417.
Julius Caesar. By William Shakespeare. R. S. Dorsch, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 423.
King John. By William Shakespeare. E. A. J. Honigmann, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.
Language: A Modern Synthesis. Joshua Whatmough. Rev. by Lee S. Hultzén. 315.
Language, Meaning and Reality: A Study of Symbolism. F. F. Nesbit. Rev. by Robert Albright. 434.
Language of Communism, The. Harry Hodgkinson. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. John B. Carroll, ed. Rev. by Dean C. Barnlund. 433.
Lectures to My Students. C. H. Spurgeon. Rev. by Lionel Crocker. 210.
Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. William Haller. Rev. by Roy F. Hudson. 79.
Life of Matthew Simpson, The. Robert D. Clark. Rev. by Robert Gray Gunderson. 307.
Lincoln the President: Last Full Measure. J. G. Randall and Richard N. Current. Rev. by Earl W. Wiley. 77.
Linguistic Science and the Teaching of English. Henry Lee Smith, Jr. Rev. by Harold B. Allen. 326.
Listening for Speech Sounds. Empress Y. Zedler. Rev. by Laura F. Wright. 89.
Living Lincoln, The. Paul M. Angle and Earl Schenck Miers, eds. Rev. by Barnet Baskerville. 194.
Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. Wilbur Samuel Howell. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 304.

Main Street on the Middle Border. Lewis Atherton. Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 196.
Members of Parliament 1734-1832. Gerrit P. Judd, IV. Rev. by Charles Daniel Smith. 416.
Merchant of Venice, The. By William Shakespeare. J. R. Brown, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.
Metalogicon of John of Salisbury, The. Daniel D. McGarry, tr. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 78.
Minor Attic Orators, II: Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades, Hyperides. J. O. Burtt, tr. Rev. by Harry Caplan. 190.
Moto-Kinesthetic Speech Training. Edna Hill Young and Sara Stinchfield Hawk. Rev. by Charlotte G. Wells. 325.
Mrs. Fiske and the American Theatre. Archie Binns and Olive Kooken. Rev. by Garff B. Wilson. 310.
Mutual Flame, The: On Shakespeare's Sonnets and the Phoenix and the Turtle. G. Wilson Knight. Rev. by Wallace A. Bacon. 201.

N. F. S. Gundtvig: An American Study. Ernest D. Nielsen. Rev. by P. Merville Larson. 195.
Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1955. Marshall R. Jones, ed. Rev. by William S. Howell. 205.
Negotiating with the Russians. Raymond Dennett and Joseph E. Johnson, eds. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Nine Great Plays: From Aeschylus to Eliot. Leonard F. Dean, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 210.
Notebook for Public Speaking. Ray Ehrensberger and Elaine Pagel. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 211.

One Mighty Torrent: The Drama of Biography. Edgar Johnson. Rev. by Donald J. Winslow. 82.
Opinions and Personality. M. Brewster Smith, Jerome S. Bruner, and Robert W. White. Rev. by William S. Howell. 318.
Oral Communication in Business. David C. Phillips. Rev. by Milton J. Wiksell. 91.
Oral Reading. Lionel Crocker and Louis M. Eich. Rev. by Donald E. Hargis. 439.

Philosophy of Jonathan Edwards from his Private Notebooks, The. Harvey G. Townsend, ed. Rev. by Orville Hitchcock. 440.
Poems of Ben Jonson. George Burke Johnston, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 100.
Portrait of a Statesman. Dennis Bardens. Rev. by Carroll C. Arnold. 308.
Present Day Psychology. A. A. Roback, ed. Rev. by Elwood Murray. 86.
Principles and Practice of Preaching. Ilion T. Jones. Rev. by Edmund Holt Linn. 437.

Principles and Types of Speech. Alan H. Monroe. Rev. by Wofford G. Gardner. 95.
Pronunciation of English in Australia, The. A. G. Mitchell. Rev. by A. L. McLeod. 207.
Public Opinion in Soviet Russia: A Study in Mass Persuasion. Alex Inkeles. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Public Relations in Education. Clifford Lee Brownell, Leo Gans and Tufie Z. Maroon. Rev. by Howard Stephenson. 98.
Public Speaking for College Students. Lionel Crocker. Rev. by James N. Holm. 323.

Representative American Speeches: 1954-1955. A. Craig Baird, ed. Rev. by A. L. Thurman, Jr. 309.
Road to Persuasion, The. William Muehl. Rev. by Wayne C. Minnick. 435.
Roman Mind, The: Studies in the History of Thought from Cicero to Marcus Aurelius. Martin L. Clarke. Rev. by James J. Murphy. 439.

Sane Society, The. Erich Fromm. Rev. by Dale D. Drum. 87.
Santayana and the Sense of Beauty. Willard E. Arnett. Rev. by William R. Gondin. 430.
Sent Forth to Preach. Jesse Burton Weatherspoon. Rev. by Edmund H. Linn. 94.
Slow to Talk. Jane Beasley. Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 432.
South Lives in History, The: Southern Historians and their Legacy. Wendell Holmes Stephenson. Rev. by Dallas C. Dickey. 193.
Special Education for the Exceptional. Merle E. Frampton and Elena D. Gall, eds. Rev. by Herold Lillywhite. 314.
Speculative Instruments. I. A. Richards. Rev. by Donald C. Bryant. 198.
Speech after Laryngectomy. Louis M. Di Carlo, Walter W. Amster, and Gilbert R. Herer. Rev. by Lester L. Hale. 431.
Speech and Your Personality. Theodore F. Nelson and W. Kirtley Atkinson. Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam. 90.
Speech Handicapped School Children. Wendell Johnson, Spencer F. Brown, James F. Curtis, Clarence W. Edney, and Jacqueline Keaster. Rev. by Wayne L. Thurman. 325.
Speech in the Elementary Classroom. Charles Van Riper and Katherine G. Butler. Rev. by Wilbert Pronovost. 87.
Spiritual Values in Shakespeare. Ernest Marshall Howse. Rev. by E. Winston Jones. 93.
Staff Role in Management, The. Robert C. Sampson. Rev. by Robert C. Martin. 92.
Stagecraft for Nonprofessionals. F. A. Buerki. Rev. by Willard F. Bellman. 205.
Stuttering: A Psychodynamic Approach to its Understanding and Treatment. Dominick A. Barbara. Rev. by Paul C. Boomsliter. 432.

Television Actor's Manual, The. William Hodapp. Rev. by Eugene S. Foster. 208.
Television-Radio Audience and Religion, The. Everett C. Parker, David W. Barry and Dallas W. Smythe. Rev. by Paul H. Boase. 322.
Television Techniques. Hoyland Bettinger. Rev. by Garrett L. Starmer. 211.
Tempest, The. By William Shakespeare. Frank Kermode, ed. Rev. by Pat M. Ryan, Jr. 84.
Theatre Annual, 1955, The. Blanche A. Corwin, ed. Rev. by Harold V. Gould. 82.
These Were Actors: A Story of the Chapmans and the Drakes. George D. Ford. Rev. by Elbert R. Bowen. 311.
Thomas Cranmer, Theologian. G. W. Bromiley. Rev. by William H. Bos. 440.
Town Hall Tonight. Harlowe R. Hoyt. Rev. by Richard Moody. 201.
Trippingly on the Tongue. Harry J. Heltman. Rev. by Louise Kingman. 314.
Triumph of the Eggheads. Horace Coon. Rev. by Richard Murphy. 197.

Unexpected Truce. Don Geiger. Rev. by Charlotte I. Lee. 429.

Working for More Effective Speech. Harvey Cromwell. Rev. by Wofford G. Gardner. 95.
Worldwide Communist Propaganda Activities. F. Bowen Evans, ed. Rev. by Robert T. Oliver. 421.
Writing for Television. Eric Heath. Rev. by Harold E. Nelson. 212.

Year's Work in Modern Language Studies, The. S. C. Aston, ed. Rev. by Harold B. Allen. 97.
Young Augustine, The. John J. O'Meara. Rev. by Ray Nadeau. 191.
Your Voice is You. Myrtle H. Cannon. Rev. by Letitia Raubicheck. 99.

THE FORUM

Appointments. The Forum. 294.
Budgets Submitted by Finance Committee. The Forum. 183.
Committees for 1956. The Forum. 181.
Election of 1957 Officers. The Forum. 292.
Excerpts from Minutes of the Business Meeting. The Forum. 180.
Increasing and Using the Supply of Teachers of Speech. J. Jeffery Auer. The Forum. 295.
New Editor Takes Over, A. Wilbur Samuel Howell. The Forum. 407.
Notice of Intent to Organize Interest Group. The Forum. 410.
Officers of Interest Groups. The Forum. 183.
Presentation of "A History and Criticism of American Public Address," Volume III. The Forum. 185.
Report of the Committee to Nominate the Editor of *The Speech Teacher* for the Term 1958-1960. The Forum. 295.
Report of the Nominating Committee. The Forum. 64.
Report on Election of 1956 Nominating Committee. The Forum. 181.
Report on the SAA Placement Service. The Forum. 184.
Source Materials in the Field of Theatre. Albert E. Johnson. The Forum. 409.
Speech Association of America: Excerpts from the Minutes of the Executive Council. The Forum. 179.